United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 24, 2000 No. 97

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 208. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contributions of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4810) ''An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2812. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Our God and Savior, at times we seem to be like sheep gone astray. Yet here we are now gathered together. Called by Your voice, make us attentive to Your word. Being restless in our world, grant us Your peace.

Gathered as representatives of the people in this Nation, we ask You to be present in our midst. We come here to serve Your purpose today.

We pledge ourselves to serve Your people that they may see themselves as one Nation held by You and guided by Your spirit. For You are the shepherd and guardian of our souls, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

On July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John W. Gibson of the United States Capitol Hill Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 558, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Paul Coverdell:

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. LEWIS, Georgia;
Mr. HASTERT, Illinois;
Mr. BISHOP, Georgia;
Mr. COLLINS, Georgia;
Mr. DEAL, Georgia;
Mr. KINGSTON, Georgia;
Mr. LINDER, Georgia;
Ms. MCKINNEY, Georgia;
Mr. BARR, Georgia;
Mr. CHAMBLISS, Georgia;
Mr. NORWOOD, Georgia;
Mr. ISAKSON, Georgia; and
Mr. GRAHAM, South Carolina.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, Social Security is a solemn promise from the United States to its citizens, a promise that this Republican-led Congress is dedicated to keeping.

For more than 30 years, the Social Security Trust Fund was used as a slush fund for government spending by the Democrats and their leadership. However, this Republican Congress stopped this dangerous practice by implementing a fiscally responsible budget; and we passed the Social Security Lockbox Act, which protects the Social Security Trust Fund permanently.

This Republican-led Congress is dedicated to ensuring that all Americans can rely on Social Security, now and in the future.

I call upon the administration to follow our lead and help assure all Americans, young and old, that Social Security will be there for them when they retire.

I yield back the administration's irresponsible tax-and-spend policies that only jeopardize the future of Social Security.

TIME TO STOP THE CASH COW FOR RUSSIA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the CEO of the Bank of New York has admitted to laundering $7 billion; and bingo, surprise, surprise, $5 billion of it is expected to be Russian dollars that they got from the International Monetary Fund.

Now, if that is not enough to barf up your vodka, the investigators say, in addition to that, Russian politicians have secretly stolen $15 billion, diverted them to bank accounts all over the world, and most of the money came from Uncle Sam.

Unbelievable, Uncle Sam giving billions to Russia to dismantle their nukes. They do not dismantle their nukes. They sell their nukes to Iran and China. China then aims them at us. Russia comes back, asks us for more money, the White House gives more billions.

Beam me up. I say it is time to stop the cash cow for Russia.

Madam Speaker, I yield back all the cash the Russian politicians have been stealing from the American taxpayers.

UTAH PIONEER DAY CELEBRATION

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Utah's pioneer heritage. The State of Utah is celebrating the arrival of the first company of Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley today.

These pioneers and the many wagon and handcart companies that followed on the trek from Nauvoo, Illinois, believed that they could build a better way of life in the West. They were tough. They suffered blistering and freezing temperatures. Many succumbed to the limited food supplies. They walked more than a thousand miles from Illinois to Utah, and many died along the way.

Those that survived had the strength necessary to thrive in the desert and harsh climates of the West. Evidence of their toils surrounds us today. There is a ditch in Wayne County, Utah, that brought water 5 miles from a mountain lake to the farms in the valley.

The amazing thing about this simple irrigation ditch is that it was built by hand. More water would disappear into the sandy soil than could be used for the crops at the end of the ditch. But all their hard work, in the words of Isaiah, made ''the desert blossom like a rose.''

There are several dams in my district that need repairs. The discussions about those repairs are centered around the roads needed to be built to bring the equipment in. The dams had been built over 100 years ago by Mormon pioneers by hand. Hand repairs were not an option now because the builders ''were much tougher back then.''

These dams, as well as countless landmarks, buildings and cities stand today as evidence of the Mormon pioneers' strength and determination. They were central to the westward expansion, providing a place of rest and resupply for travelers heading to the gold fields of California and the Oregon territory.

Their strengths, self-sufficiency, and determination have become the cultural foundation of the West. I am proud to be the descendent of the Mormon pioneers and to live with the fruits of their labors. I am proud to join my fellow Utahans in honoring and celebrating our pioneer heritage. The desert truly has blossomed like a rose.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such record votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6:00 p.m. today.

□ 1415

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING SAFETY AND WELL-BEING OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS WHILE TRAVELING IN MEXICO

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) expressing the sense of Congress concerning the safety and well-being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 232

Whereas hundreds of United States citizens travel by automobile to Mexico every day;

Whereas United States automobile insurance in not valid in Mexico and travellers may purchase additional insurance to cover potential liability or injury while in Mexico;

Whereas in cases where additional insurance is not purchased and a United States citizen is involved in an automobile accident, the American will be subject to a bond requirement before being permitted to return to the United States; and

Whereas in a recent incident, a United States citizen injured in an automobile accident in Mexico was not transferred to a United States hospital for 18 hours, even after medical personnel in Mexico recommended his immediate transfer to the United States for emergency treatment, until the family posted the bond set by Mexican authorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, in order to protect the safety and well-being of United States citizens travelling in Mexico, the President should continue to negotiate with the Government of Mexico to establish procedures, including a humanitarian exemption to Mexican bond requirements, to ensure the expedited return of United States citizens injured in Mexico to the United States for medical treatment, if necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 232.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, as the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, this Member rises in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 232. This resolution, which expresses the sense of Congress regarding the safety and well-being of United States citizens who are traveling in Mexico, was introduced by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). It is the result of a particularly unfortunate incident involving a California resident caught in a conflict between Mexican law and sound medical treatment provided to U.S. citizens as well as to other foreign citizens while traveling in Mexico.

Last August, California resident Donald Craft, his wife, and three children were vacationing in Baja, Mexico, when they were involved in a serious automobile incident. Mr. Craft broke his neck and was in critical condition when he was taken to a local Mexican hospital where doctors advised his family that he be immediately transported to a trauma center in San Diego for more intensive life-saving medical care.

There was, however, one problem. Under Mexican law, foreigners involved in traffic accidents being investigated for possible criminal action or who do not have Mexican automobile insurance cannot leave Mexico until a bond is posted. Mrs. Melody Craft, the victim's wife, was required to find and pay $7,000 before her critically injured husband would be allowed to leave the country. After what must have been a very confusing and unbelievably excruciating period of almost 18 hours, the bond was raised and Mr. Craft was released and sent back to the United States.

Regrettably, on September 6, 1999, Mr. Craft died of complications reportedly associated with that accident and the delay in providing him adequate medical attention. Sadly, this tragedy has been repeated on several additional occasions since Mr. Craft's death, including a case involving a Florida constituent of our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Miami (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Madam Speaker, I would also like to indicate that in 1998, one of my constituents, Gregg Gahan, the adult son of Mr. and Mrs. Duane Gahan of Oakland, Nebraska, Mr. Gahan being the editor of the Oakland Independent, a newspaper serving that area, was also involved in a similar accident with also extraordinary things that happened that really defy a rational explanation and amount to an abuse of the legal or ethical process by Mexican officials.

Grave concerns arose as a result of the treatment of his son by law enforcement officials, health care officials, and the driver of the car who hit him. There are legitimate questions about the judicial process that was implemented, how culpability was determined, the punitive actions taken, and the damage settlement.

Madam Speaker, we know and appreciate the fact that Mexico has its own laws and procedures and that those should be known and respected by foreign visitors. However, in these kinds of very serious accident cases, flexibility and accommodation of the special circumstances ought to be in order.

Since the Craft incident, this Member has been told that the U.S. and Mexican Governments have initiated a dialogue on how to address this issue. This resolution is designed to support these efforts to seek a reasonable solution to a situation under Mexican law which places the health and well-being of Americans and other foreign visitors to Mexico in question.

The State Department has been consulted on this legislation and has no objection to it. The Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations and, subsequently, the full committee, reported the legislation by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to join him in supporting adoption of H. Con. Res. 232.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

REQUEST TO BE ADDED AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 232, S. CON. RES. 81, H.R. 4002, AND H.R. 4919

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be added to H. Con. Res. 232 as a cosponsor, and also as a cosponsor of the three other pieces of legislation that will follow this, S. Con. Res. 81, H.R. 4002 and H.R. 4919, the Security Assistance Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As to cosponsorship of House bills, the gentleman should talk to the primary sponsor of the bill. It is not done by unanimous consent. Only the sponsor may add cosponsors.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. This bill sends the right message. It is a bill brought to this House's attention by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who represent the portion of California that is immediately adjacent to Mexico.

This resolution puts Congress on record in favor of ensuring that U.S. citizens traveling in Mexico have access without delay to emergency medical services. This is of particular importance to all of us in California and along the U.S.-Mexico border. Our citizens travel to Mexico; and when they are involved in an automobile accident, they encounter the Mexican law that requires the posting of a bond, a bond which ordinary automobile insurance does not provide for.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in this resolution and to support the negotiation with Mexico of a system for at least dealing with those American motorists who are insured and need help on an emergency basis. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 232.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to reiterate my request that this be given strong support by my colleagues.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hunter resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. citizens who are injured while traveling in Mexico should have immediate access to medical treatment in the United States. We drafted this resolution in response to several instances where Americans were prevented by Mexican authorities from accessing U.S. hospitals after being injured while traveling in Mexico.

Specifically, this resolution calls upon President Clinton to continue negotiations with the Mexican government to establish a humanitarian exemption to bond requirements that prevent the release of American citizens involved in accidents. One tragic example of this problem happened on August 24, 1999. Donald Kraft of Southern California was involved in an automobile accident in Baja California, Mexico, in which he suffered a broken neck and other injuries. Despite needing quality medical care that was unavailable in Mexico, Mr. Kraft was forced to wait over 18 hours before authorities approved his return to the United States pending his family posting a bond to cover damages for the collision. Mr. Kraft died a few days later in San Diego.

This experience was repeated again in November 1999 when three men from Orange County were involved in an accident that killed the driver and left the two others injured. Family members were required to post an $11,000 bond before one of the victims was allowed to be transferred to San Diego where he was treated for multiple fractures, a ruptured spleen and a punctured lung. The remaining victim was required to stay in jail until family members convinced authorities that he should be transported to a Tijuana hospital.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans travel abroad, they must not be denied access to medical treatment. The United States and Mexico need to agree on procedures to ensure that the horrible situations of the past never happen again. Our citizens need these protections. The Mexican government can and should make these concessions to our tourists in order to protect Americans in Mexico, and the Mexican tourism industry.

My colleagues, we need to pass this resolution, I urge you to vote yes.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to commend Representative DUNCAN HUNTER for introducing this resolution and bringing this matter to the floor of the House.

We will be proceeding with a resolution congratulating the Mexican people on their recent election on July 2nd. That election has ushered in a spirit of renewal both in Mexico and as regards our very important bilateral relations.

This resolution reminds us that our relationship with Mexico involves many matters that concern both nations.

H. Res. 232 urges the President to continue to negotiate with the Government of Mexico to establish procedures for the expedited return of U.S. citizens injured in Mexico.

There is good reason for the Congress to pass this resolution. U.S. citizens who do not purchase additional automobile insurance required by the Mexican government, and are then injured in an automobile accident, are subject to a bond requirement before they can return to the United States for medical treatment.

On August 24, 1999, Donald Kraft of Southern California was involved in an automobile accident in Baja California in which he suffered a broken neck and other injuries. Mr. Kraft was forced to wait 18 hours before authorities approved his return to the United States only after his family posted a bond to cover damages for the collision. Mr. Kraft died a few days later in San Diego.

The United States and Mexico should work together so we can avoid similar tragedies in the future.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of people leave the port of Miami, located in my congressional district, on cruise ships that take them to foreign lands. Yet these tourists never consider what they would do if they found themselves in an emergency situation abroad.

What was supposed to be a peaceful vacation cruise to Mexico for a couple in my congressional district, turned out to be a nightmare that continues to haunt Michael and Lorraine Andrews today. Fifteen minutes before their ship departed from one of the ports, Michael and Lorraine's car went off the road and into a ravine, causing a tragic accident that would change their lives forever. With no passport, no money and no real means of identification, Lorraine Andrews had a difficult time in obtaining medical assistance for her husband who had lost sensation below his neck. It took approximately an hour and a half before an air ambulance arrived and even then, American dollars had to be exchanged for medical attention. Today, Michael is an incomplete quadriplegic and he and his wife are working to make a difference so that others do not experience similar difficulties.

H. Con. Res. 232, expressing the sense of Congress concerning the safety and well being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico, is a step in the right direction to secure safety for our citizens and raise awareness on ways in which they can better protect themselves. The safety of our citizens must come first and our President must immediately begin negotiations with the Government of Mexico to establish a humanitarian exemption to Mexican bond requirements. No American's life should be endangered due to the existence of a Mexican law requiring an exhaustive investigation of an accident before emergency medical help in the United States is found. No American should be denied the right to emergency medical assistance because a release bond must be paid up front. Humanitarian considerations should be allowed to override any regulatory, so that emergencies like that of Michael and Lorraine Andrews will be prevented in the future. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 232, and I ask my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 232, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING RELEASE OF RABIYA KADEER, HER SECRETARY AND SON BY GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 81

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer, a prominent ethnic Uighur from the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region (XUAR) of the People's Republic of China, her secretary, and her son were arrested on August 11, 1999, in the city of Urumqi;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer's arrest occurred outside the Yindu Hotel in Urumqi as she was attempting to meet a group of congressional staff staying at the Yindu Hotel as part of an official visit to China organized under the auspices of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of the United States Information Agency;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer's husband Sidik Rouzi, who has lived in the United States since 1996 and works for Radio Free Asia, has been critical of the policies of the People's Republic of China toward Uighurs in Xinjiang;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer was sentenced on March 10 to 8 years in prison ''with deprivation of political rights for two years'' for the crime of ''illegally giving state information across the border'';

Whereas the Urumqi Evening Paper of March 12 reported Rabiya Kadeer's case as follows: ''The court investigated the following: The defendant Rabiya Kadeer, following the request of her husband, Sidik Haji, who has settled in America, indirectly bought a collection of the Kashgar Paper dated from 1995–1998, 27 months, and some copies of the Xinjiang Legal Paper and on 17 June 1999 sent them by post to Sidik Haji. These were found by the customs. During July and August 1999 defendant Rabiya Kadeer gave copies of the Ili Paper and Ili Evening Paper collected by others to Mohammed Hashem to keep. Defendant Rabiya Kadeer sent these to Sidik Haji. Some of these papers contained the speeches of leaders of different levels; speeches about the strength of rectification of public safety, news of political legal organisations striking against national separatists and terrorist activities etc. The papers sent were marked and folded at relevant articles. As well as this, on 11 August that year, defendant Rabiya Kadeer, following her husband's phone commands, took a previously prepared list of people who had been handled by judicial organisations, with her to Kumush Astana Hotel [Yingdu Hotel] where she was to meet a foreigner'';

Whereas reports indicate that Ablikim Abdyirim was sent to a labor camp on November 26 for 2 years without trial for ''supporting Uighur separatism,'' and Rabiya Kadeer's secretary was recently sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer has 5 children, 3 sisters, and a brother living in the United States, in addition to her husband, and Kadeer has expressed a desire to move to the United States;

Whereas the People's Republic of China stripped Rabiya Kadeer of her passport long before her arrest;

Whereas reports indicate that Kadeer's health may be at risk;

Whereas the People's Republic of China signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on October 5, 1998;

Whereas that Covenant requires signatory countries to guarantee their citizens the right to legal recourse when their rights have been violated, the right to liberty and freedom of movement, the right to presumption of innocence until guilt is proven, the right to appeal a conviction, freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of assembly and association;

Whereas that Covenant forbids torture, inhuman or degrading treatment, and arbitrary arrest and detention;

Whereas the first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights enables the Human Rights Committee, set up under that Covenant, to receive and consider communications from individuals claiming to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant; and

Whereas in signing that Covenant on behalf of the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Qin Huasun, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, said the following: ''To realize human rights is the aspiration of all humanity. It is also a goal that the Chinese Government has long been striving for. We believe that the universality of human rights should be respected . . . As a member state of the United Nations, China has always actively participated in the activities of the organization in the field of human rights. It attaches importance to its cooperation with agencies concerned in the U.N. system . . .'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China—

(1) immediately to release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son; and

(2) to permit Kadeer, her secretary, and her son to move to the United States, if they so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. Con. Res. 81.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member stands in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 81, which was introduced by the senior senator from Delaware, Senator WILLIAM ROTH, and approved by the Senate on May 2.

On June 27, S. Con. Res. 81 was approved by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, which this Member chairs, and was subsequently approved unanimously by the Committee on International Relations on June 29.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the People's Republic of China, PRC, should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and allow them to move to the United States if they so desire.

Rabiya Kadeer is a prominent ethnic Uigher from China, who was arrested as she was attempting to meet a congressional staff delegation visiting Urumqi as part of an official visit to China organized under the auspices of the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Program of the U.S. Information Agency.

Subsequently, on March 10 of this year, Rabiya Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in prison for the crime of ''illegally giving state information across the border.'' Previously, her son was sent to a labor camp for 2 years in November of 1999 for supporting Uighur separatism and her secretary was recently sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp. In Ms. Kadeer's case, the so-called ''state information'' appears to have consisted essentially of a collection of publicly available Chinese newspaper articles and speeches and a list of prisoners.

As the resolution notes, this case appears to constitute a clear violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Chinese Government's action in this case has been reprehensible and must be reversed. This resolution makes clear the strong sense of the Congress that Ms. Kadeer should be immediately released and allowed to join her family in the United States.

Madam Speaker, approving S. Con. Res. 81 sends a strong message that while this body approves of improved trade relations, we are, nonetheless, mindful of the serious human rights problems that exist within the People's Republic of China.

This is an entirely appropriate message to send, for the United States cannot turn a blind eye to the abuses that continue to exist in the PRC.

Madam Speaker, this Member urges adoption of S. Con. Res. 81.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and commend the chairman of the Committee on International Relations (Mr. GILMAN); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, my colleague here, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER); and the ranking Democratic members, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their strong support.

The subject of this resolution is Rabiya Kadeer, who is well-known as a Uighur businesswoman and known throughout China as ''the millionaire woman of Xinjiang.'' She is also a philanthropist of many programs designed to improve the lives of Uighur women and children.

Her work led to her election as a member of a nationwide advisory body of the Chinese government from 1993 through 1997, and as a delegate to the United Nations Women's Conference in 1995. She has helped many Uighur women start businesses, and she has established English language classes for Uighur teenagers, several of whom she has sent to the United States for schooling.

Rabiya Kadeer's husband, who is of Uighur descent, fled to the United States in 1996, and she was stripped of her government position when she refused to criticize him. Kadeer was arrested last year on her way to meet with congressional staff members, charged with providing information to foreigners, and sentenced to 8 years in prison.

As my colleague from Nebraska pointed out, these charges were without merit. Unfortunately, it appears that Kadeer's real crime is that her husband now works for Radio Free Asia and he has been critical of the policies of the PRC toward Uighurs in Xinjiang. This situation is all the more troubling because Kadeer has five children and three sisters living in the United States in addition to her husband.

This resolution before the House today calls on the Chinese to release Rabiya Kadeer, as well as her son, and secretary, arrested at the same time, and allow them to come to the United States.

It is with regret that I note that this House passed a provision giving the People's Republic of China most favored nation status on a permanent basis, so the Chinese are free to ignore this resolution, without the slightest risk of losing a single penny of trade benefits with the United States, where they enjoy the largest trade surplus and one of the most lopsided trading relationships that one can imagine.

So although I doubt this resolution will have much effect, given the fact that we have cut ourselves off from any way of really pressuring the Chinese government, it is the least we could do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 81.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. Con. Res. 81, a resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to release immediately and unconditionally the prominent Uighur businesswoman, Ms. Rebiya Kadeer.

Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I have repeatedly voiced my deepest concern regarding Ms. Kadeer to the Chinese Government. Ms. Kadeer was detained by Chinese security forces in Urumqi, Xinjiang Province on August 11, 1999. A particularly disturbing circumstance is the fact that shortly before her arrest, her husband, Mr. Sidick Rozi, had testified to Members of Congress before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on July 15, 1999, regarding human rights violations in Western China.

As a prominent businesswoman, Ms. Kadeer is well known and respected in the United States. Her efforts to promote business enterprises by Uighur women have been recognized by Chinese authorities as contributing to the overall economic and social development of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. Until 1998, she even served as an elected official in the Provincial People's Political Consultative Congress.

On September 2, 1999, however, according to press reports she was charged with the serious crime of ''illegally offering state secrets across the border.'' Ms. Kadeer was detained on August 11, 1999, while on her way to meet with a U.S. congressional staff delegation, whom she intended to give information about political prisoners in Xinjiang. She was convicted under Article 111 of the Chinese Criminal Law. According to Radio Free Asia, neither Kadeer nor her lawyer were allowed to speak at her trial.

Chinese officials never produced evidence of criminal wrongdoing against Ms. Kadeer. She was nonetheless sentenced to 8 years in prison in a secret trial at the Urumqi City Intermediate People's Court in the capital of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. In addition, according to information we have received, she is currently detained at Liudaowan jail, a jail notorious for mistreatment of prisoners.

In addition to Ms. Kadeer, her son, Ablikim Abyirim, and her secretary, Kahriman Abdukirim, were also detained in August and were administratively sentenced to 2- and 3-year terms, respectively, on November 26, 1999. They are currently being held at the Walabai Reeducation Through Labor School.

Madam Speaker, the trial and the totally fabricated charges brought against Ms. Kadeer, her son, and her secretary are blatant violations of international judicial standards. As the other body prepares to consider PNTR for the Peoples Republic of China, it is my hope that our colleagues keep these outrageous human rights violations in mind. The Economist reports that China executed three Uighurs as recently as the first week of July of this year, and the harassment and the crackdown against Tibetans, the Falun Gong, and political dissidents continues unabated.

Madam Speaker, it is high time to send the PRC a clear message. The resolution before the House sends a clear message. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution and join with my colleague in urging the Chinese authorities to release from Rebiya Kadeer, her secretary and her son, and permit them to move to the United States, if they desire.

Ms. Kadeer is a well respected businesswoman who was once officially touted as an inspiration to her fellow members of the Uighur ethnic group. On March 10th, 2000, Ms. Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in jail for ''giving information to separatists outside the country.'' Her efforts to business enterprises have been recognized by Chinese authorities as contributing to the overall economic and social development of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region, one of the poorest regions throughout China.

However, in 1997, Ms. Kadeer was stripped of her passport, and with it the right to freedom of movement as well as subjected to continual police harassments. These actions were clearly aimed at silencing her husband, Mr. Sidick Rozi, a former political prisoner who has been an outspoken critic of China's treatment of the Uighur minority in Western China. Mr. Rozi, now living in the United States, has made numerous statements on Radio Free Asia, Voice of America and testified last July before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus concerning the extremely harsh discriminations suffered by the Uighur minority. Ms. Kadeer was made a hostage in her own country, unable to join her husband and a number of her children in the United States, simply because of the political activities of her husband.

On August 11th, 1999 Rebiya Kadeer was arrested while she was on her way to meet with a group of congressional staff visiting China. She was charged in September with ''providing secret information to foreigners.'' Ms. Kadeer does not have access to ''state secrets,'' she is a businesswoman, not a political activist. After 7 months of detention and the arrest and subsequent arbitrary sentencing of her secretary and one son, Ms. Kadeer was given a 4-hour trial. During this trial, neither she nor her lawyer were able to speak, none of her children were allowed to attend and the 300 Uighurs who had gathered at the courthouse were dispersed by Chinese police.

If China wants to be a full partner in the international arena, it has to start abiding by international norms and living within the rule of law. Seven months of arbitrary detention and a trial where the defendant's lawyer is not allowed to speak is not an accepted practice within the international community and should not be an accepted practice in China.

Ms. Kadeer was traveling to meet with congressional staff, official representatives of the U.S. Government, when she was detained. This did not seem to matter to the Chinese and it appears to be one of the factors for the timing of her arrest. Clearly, the Chinese were sending a signal: Any citizen who meets with or talks to U.S. citizens is risking detention, arrest and a prison sentence.

Incidences such as this prove that now is not the time to ease the pressure on China. We in the United States, and around the world must never give up our ideals and belief in human freedom, and need to pressure dictators, oppressors and abusers around the world that lack the respect for the rule of law and for human life. Only if Ms. Kadeer's case is brought to the highest level of our administration and the Chinese Government is there any hope that Ms. Kadeer will not spend the next 8 years of her life in a Chinese prison—8 years she should be spending with her husband and 10 children—and for speaking up for the most basic human rights of her people, the Uighurs.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the work of the International Relations Committee, particularly the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, in moving this important resolution forward. Today we are considering the Senate version of the resolution I introduced, H. Con. Res. 249, which has 11 cosponsors.

As the chairman has noted, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary and her son, and permit them to move to the United States.

Kadeer is a 53-year-old entrepreneur from China's Xingjiang Autonomous Region. As a member of the Uighur minority, she emerged as a symbol of how minorities could succeed in China. However, her relationship with the Chinese Government deteriorated after her husband's emigration to the United States in 1997. Sidik Rouzi has become a prominent critic of China's Xingjiang policies and testified last summer before the House Congressional Human Rights Caucus.

On August 11, 1999, Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and two of her sons were arrested in Urumqi, China and charged with ''illegally providing intelligence for foreign organizations.'' She was apparently arrested en route to a previously scheduled meeting with U.S. congressional staff. A member of my staff was part of this official delegation, organized under the auspices of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of the U.S. Information Agency.

The arrest prior to a meeting with an official delegation was an affront to Congress. Members and staff should be allowed to travel internationally and conduct their official duties without fear that their visit will trigger retributive action by the host country. One purpose of this staff delegation was to encourage mutual understanding and cultural exchange—the arrest was clearly contrary to this purpose. Such intimidation should never accompany an official delegation visit.

Even more troubling, Kadeer was convicted and sentenced to 8 years in prison for merely mailing copies of local newspapers to her husband in the United States. Apparently, her high crime was to mark and fold the newspapers in such a way that she was illegally revealing state information.

In February, I received a letter from the Chinese Ambassador noting ''Ethnic secessionism in Xingjiang and Tibet is a deep concern for us. I hope our American friends could put themselves in our shoes when approaching this issue.'' I do not believe that Chinese concerns about ethnic affairs merit a suspension of human rights.

Indeed, this resolution merely calls for the People's Republic of China to adhere to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which guarantees citizens the right to legal recourse when their rights have been violated and forbids arbitrary arrest and detention. Even though a Chinese court dismissed this case last November for lack of evidence, Kadeer was tried again. The second trial lasted all of two hours, and according to Human Rights Watch, neither she nor her attorney were permitted to even speak. China signed this Covenant in 1998 and has an obligation to respect the civil and political rights of all Chinese citizens, irrespective of their ethnicity.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join the other body in passing this important resolution. China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and should allow them to move to the United States. Vote in support of this resolution and send a strong message to China that they must respect the political rights of all of their citizens.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairmen and ranking minority members of the International Operations and Human Rights, and the Asia and Pacific Subcommittees for their work on this important resolution.

Ms. Rabiya Kadeer, her son and secretary were arrested in Chinese-occupied East Turkestan or the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region on August 11, 1999, as they were attempting to meet with a group of congressional staff. Ms. Kadeer's husband works for Radio Free Asia and has been critical of the Chinese occupation of his homeland. After their arrest, the three individuals were eventually accused of illegally giving Mr. Kadeer various news clippings and public speeches concerning the struggle in East Turkestan.

Ms. Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in prison, her son was sent to a labor camp for 2 years and her secretary to 3 years. The resolution calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately release them and permit them to move to the United States if so they desire. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 81.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

FAMINE PREVENTION AND FREEDOM FROM HUNGER IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4002) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to revise and improve provisions relating to famine prevention and freedom from hunger, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.—(1) The first sentence of section 296(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(a)) is amended to read as follows: ''The Congress declares that, in order to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources, the United States should mobilize the capacities of the United States land-grant universities, other eligible universities, and public and private partners of universities in the United States and other countries, consistent with sections 103 and 103A of this Act, for (1) global research on problems affecting food, agriculture, forestry, and fisheries, (2) improved human capacity and institutional resource development for the global application of agricultural and related environmental sciences, (3) agricultural development and trade research and extension services in the United States and other countries to support the entry of rural industries into world markets, and (4) providing for the application of agricultural sciences to solving food, health, nutrition, rural income, and environmental problems, especially such problems in low-income, food deficit countries.''.

(2) The second sentence of section 296(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''in this country'' and inserting ''with and through the private sector in this country and to understanding processes of economic development'';

(B) in paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(2) that land-grant and other universities in the United States have demonstrated over many years their ability to cooperate with international agencies, educational and research institutions in other countries, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations worldwide, in expanding global agricultural production, processing, business and trade, to the benefit of the United States and other countries;'';

(C) in paragraph (3), to read as follows:

''(3) that, in a world of growing populations with rising expectations, increased food production and improved distribution, storage, and marketing in the developing countries is necessary not only to prevent hunger and ensure human health and child survival, but to build the basis for economic growth and trade, and the social security in which democracy and a market economy can thrive, and moreover, that the greatest potential for increasing world food supplies and incomes to purchase food are in the developing countries where the gap between food need and food supply is the greatest and current incomes are lowest;'';

(D) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

''(4) that the engagement of United States universities in agricultural development in other countries strengthens the competitiveness of United States agriculture and other industries by training future foreign partners and by introducing global perspectives into United States curriculum, research, public information services, and other extension programs of the universities;'';

(E) by striking paragraphs (5) and (7), redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and inserting the following:

''(5) with expanding global markets and increasing imports into many countries, including the United States, that food safety and quality, as well as secure supply, have emerged as mutual concerns of all countries;

''(6) that research, teaching, and extension activities, and appropriate institutional and policy development therefore are prime factors in improving agricultural production, food distribution, processing, storage, and marketing abroad (as well as in the United States);'';

(F) in paragraph (7) (as redesignated), by striking ''in the United States'' and inserting ''and the broader economy of the United States''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) that there is a need to preserve and protect the world's natural resources for sustained productivity and health and to take steps to mitigate adverse aspects of climate change which confront agriculture and other natural resource-based industries with new scientific, technological, and management challenges; and

''(9) that universities and public and private partners of universities need a dependable source of Federal funding not requiring State matching funds, as well as Federal and State matched funding, and other financing, in order to increase the impact of their own investments and those of their State governments and constituencies, in order to continue and expand their effort to advance agricultural development in cooperating countries, to translate development into economic growth and trade for the United States and cooperating countries, and to prepare future teachers, researchers, extension specialists, entrepreneurs, managers, and decisionmakers for the world economy.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.—Section 296(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) Accordingly, the Congress declares that, in order to prevent famine and establish freedom from hunger, the following components must be brought together in a coordinated program to increase world food and fiber production, agricultural trade, and responsible management of natural resources, including—

''(1) continued efforts by the international agricultural research centers and other international research entities to provide a global network, including United States universities, for international scientific collaboration on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems of worldwide importance;

''(2) contract research and the implementation of collaborative research support programs and other research collaboration led by United States universities, and involving research systems in other countries focused on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems, with benefits to the United States and partner countries;

''(3) transformation of the benefits of global agricultural research and development into increased benefits for United States agriculturally related industries through establishment of development and trade information and service centers, for rural as well as urban communities, through extension, cooperatively with, and supportive of, existing public and private trade and development related organizations;

''(4) facilitation of participation by universities and public and private partners of universities in programs of multilateral banks and agencies which receive United States funds by means which may include additional complementary funds restricted to the use of United States universities and public and private partners of universities;

''(5) expanding learning opportunities about global agriculture for students, teachers, community leaders, entrepreneurs, and the general public through international internships and exchanges, graduate assistantships, faculty positions, and other means of education and extension through long-term recurring Federal funds matched by State funds; and

''(6) competitive grants through universities to United States agriculturalists and public and private partners of universities from other countries for research, institution and policy development, extension, training, and other programs for global agricultural development, trade, and responsible management of natural resources.''.

(c) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—Section 296(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''each component'' and inserting ''each of the program components described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b)'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''and public and private partners of universities'' after ''for the universities''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting ''and public and private partners of universities'' after ''such universities'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking '', and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(D) by striking the matter following subparagraph (B); and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) multilateral banks and agencies receiving United States funds;

''(D) development agencies of other countries; and

''(E) United States Government foreign assistance and economic cooperation programs; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) generally engage the United States university community more extensively in the agricultural research, trade, and development initiatives undertaken outside the United States, with the objectives of strengthening its capacity to carry out research, teaching, and extension activities for solving problems in food production, processing, marketing, and consumption in agriculturally developing nations, and for transforming progress in global agricultural research and development into economic growth, trade, and trade benefits for United States communities and industries, and for the provident use of natural resources; and

''(5) ensure that all federally funded support to universities and public and private partners of universities relating to the goals of this title is periodically reviewed for its performance.''.

(d) DEFINITION OF UNIVERSITIES.—Section 296(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''sea-grant colleges;'' the following: ''Native American land-grant colleges as authorized under the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note);''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''extension'' and inserting ''extension (including outreach)''.

(e) DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 296(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(e)) is amended by inserting ''United States'' before ''Agency''.

(f) DEFINITION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERS OF UNIVERSITIES.—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) As used in this title, the term 'public and private partners of universities' includes entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include university beneficiary groups, other

education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, nonprofit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or agency incorporated in other countries.''.

(g) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURE.—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) As used in this title, the term 'agriculture' includes the science and practice of activity related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floraculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences.''.

(h) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURISTS.—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) As used in this title, the term 'agriculturists' includes farmers, herders, and livestock producers, individuals who fish and others employed in cultivating and harvesting food resources from salt and fresh waters, individuals who cultivate trees and shrubs and harvest nontimber forest products, as well as the processors, managers, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed, and fiber system and its relationships to natural resources.''.

SEC. 3. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Section 297(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), to read as follows:

''(1) to implement program components through United States universities as authorized by paragraphs (2) through (5) of this subsection;'';

(2) in paragraph (3), to read as follows:

''(3) to provide long-term program support for United States university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning opportunities for students, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, and the general public;''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''United States'' before ''universities'';

(B) by inserting ''agricultural'' before ''research centers''; and

(C) by striking ''and the institutions of agriculturally developing nations'' and inserting ''multilateral banks, the institutions of agriculturally developing nations, and United States and foreign nongovernmental organizations supporting extension and other productivity-enhancing programs''.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 297(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''universities'' and inserting ''United States universities with public and private partners of universities''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting '', environment,'' before ''and related''; and

(ii) by striking ''farmers and farm families'' and inserting ''agriculturalists'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', including resources of the private sector,'' after ''Federal or State resources''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and the United States Department of Agriculture'' and all that follows and inserting '', the Department of Agriculture, State agricultural agencies, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Food and Drug Administration, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate nongovernmental and business organizations.''.

(c) FURTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 297(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(2) focus primarily on the needs of agricultural producers, rural families, processors, traders, consumers, and conservators of natural resources;''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

''(4) be carried out within the developing countries and transition countries comprising newly emerging democracies and newly liberalized economies; and''.

(d) SPECIAL PROGRAMS.—Section 297 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) The Administrator shall establish and carry out special programs under this title as part of ongoing programs for child survival, democratization, development of free enterprise, environmental and natural resource management, and other related programs.''.

SEC. 4. BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 298(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting after ''authorized by this title'' the following: ''and to provide United States Government followup to the World Food Summit of November 1996''; and

(2) in the third sentence, by inserting at the end before the period the following: ''on a case-by-case basis''.

(b) GENERAL AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BOARD.—Section 298(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) The Board's general areas of responsibility shall include—

''(1) participating in the planning, development, and implementation of, initiating recommendations for, and monitoring, the activities described in section 297 of this title; and

''(2) providing advice and assistance to the Inter-Agency Working Group on Food Security (IWG) on carrying out commitments made in the United States Country Paper for the November 1996 World Food Summit and on the Plan of Action agreed to at the Summit.''.

(c) DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—Section 298(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''increase food production'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''improve agricultural production, trade, and natural resource management in developing countries, and with private organizations seeking to increase agricultural production and trade, natural resources management, and household food security in developing and transition countries;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before ''sciences'' the following: '', environmental, and related social'';

(2) in paragraph (4), after ''Administrator and universities'' insert ''and their partners'';

(3) in paragraph (5), after ''universities'' insert ''and public and private partners of universities'';

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(5) in paragraph (7), by striking ''in the developing nations.'' and inserting ''and natural resource issues in the developing nations, assuring efficiency in use of Federal resources, including in accordance with the Governmental Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–62; 107 Stat. 285), and the amendments made by that Act;''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) providing advice to the United States Government on the development of a long-term action plan in support of the commitments made in the United States Country Paper and at the 1996 World Food Summit, including—

''(A) participating in the implementation of the action plan through meetings, workshops, and proper involvement; and

''(B) serving as an outreach vehicle to all nongovernmental sectors to achieve maximum involvement in action plan development and implementation;

''(9) developing information exchanges and consulting regularly with nongovernmental organizations, consumer groups, producers, agribusinesses and associations, agricultural cooperatives and commodity groups, State departments of agriculture, State agricultural research and extension agencies, and academic institutions;

''(10) investigating and resolving issues concerning implementation of this title as requested by universities; and

''(11) advising the Administrator on any and all issues as requested.''.

(d) SUBORDINATE UNITS.—Section 298(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Research'' and insert ''Policy'';

(B) by striking ''administration'' and inserting ''design''; and

(C) by striking ''section 297(a)(3) of this title'' and inserting ''section 297''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''Joint Committee on Country Programs'' and inserting ''Joint Operations Committee''; and

(B) by striking ''which shall assist'' and all that follows and inserting ''which shall assist in and advise on the mechanisms and processes for implementation of activities described in section 297.''.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 300 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220e) is amended by striking ''April 1'' and inserting ''September 1''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act of 2000, this Member wants to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for taking the lead on this important issue and introducing this legislation.

This measure updates the content of the agricultural development in Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act and expands the role of America's land grant universities in these efforts. It has certainly been a pleasure to work with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) on this effort.

Since the Foreign Assistance Act was enacted in 1961, the scope of U.S. food aid and agriculture assistance has expanded to include forestry, fisheries, family and consumer sciences, horticulture, agribusiness, agricultural processing, marketing, distribution, trade, food safety, nutrition, agricultural policy, environmental protection, food science and engineering, veterinary medicine, agriculture economics, other social sciences and other sciences and practices related to food, fiber, and feed.

Indeed, H.R. 4002 updates current law and the U.S. foreign assistance policy to reflect these changes. This legislation also ensures the transformation of developments abroad into benefits to the United States. University research and extension services, especially those associated with America's land grant colleges and universities, such as my alma mater, the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, along with their public and private partners, are supported to help transform agricultural progress abroad and into benefits to American communities and businesses through trade.

The pending legislation also expands the definition of eligible universities to include those institutions engaged in agricultural teaching, research and outreach, as well as extension. This Member believes that this is an effective and responsible approach which utilizes America's land grant university expertise to help famine prevention and alleviate the suffering from hunger and malnutrition abroad.

Madam Speaker, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Prevention Act of 2000 for the first time creates a direct link between development abroad and the interests of rural communities here at home in the United States. That is why this legislation is so important.

Again, this Member commends the hard work and leadership on this issue by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). Clearly, H.R. 4002 deserves our strong support and this Member urges its adoption by his colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for their hard work on this bill.

American farmers and agricultural institutions have long been the backbone of our foreign aid programs. The productivity of our farms have helped feed starving people around the world, and it was American research and technology developed in our land grant universities which fueled the green revolution that have helped a famine-prone India become self-sufficient in food.

Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act, was enacted in 1975 to increase world food production and identify solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. However, the agricultural sectors have experienced growth and innovation since that law was enacted. H.R. 4002 addresses that problem by updating Title XII. These changes will result in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development, improved service to and assistance to poor countries, and greater trade and research benefits to the United States.

Specifically, this bill broadens the scope of agricultural assistance to reflect a more modern industry and expands the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized. This bill also encourages NGOs, that is to say nongovernmental organizations, to work with universities.

The legislation will also help our agriculture here in the United States. Title XII as currently written is designed to focus on agricultural research. H.R. 4002 is designed to enhance extension and other outreach activities of Title XII and help bring lessons learned through those agricultural programs in developing countries to farms here in the United States.

Finally, the bill helps American farmers and others of the agricultural community to increase their markets. Developing countries are the fastest growing markets for U.S. farm products and helping strengthen agriculture in developing countries will ultimately benefit U.S. farmers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4002.

Madam Speaker, at this point I include in the RECORD the remarks of the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Bill.

The Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Act updates and expands current American policies as they relate to the elimination of global hunger.

This is vital legislation.

One very important aspect of this Bill is that it not only makes low-income, food deficit, foreign countries beneficiaries of this program, but it also makes rural and urban communities in the United States beneficiaries.

In this era of global economies, nations are becoming more interconnected and interdependent on one another.

It is critical, therefore, that the economies of developing nations are not left behind.

It is critical that these nations have stable and efficient economies.

It is vitally important, therefore, that we assist in integrating Africa into the global economy.

Boosting economic development and self-sufficiency for Africa are keys so achieving this end.

It is for these reasons and others that I was pleased to vote for the Africa Trade and Development Act of 2000.

Generally, we only hear about Africa when issues of hunger, warfare, or natural disaster emerge.

And, it is true, that hunger estimates in Africa range in upwards of 215 million chronically undernourished persons.

And, yes, we need to be concerned and provide as much assistance as possible.

However, there is an old cliche that says, ''Give a man a fish, and he'll eat for a day. Teach a man to fish, and he'll eat forever!''

At no other time is this cliche more appropriate for African countries.

As a nation, we have the resources, the capacity, and the capability to ''teach'' the tools needed to ensure that their economies grow in strength and prosperity.

One of the tools we can teach involves agribusiness.

Agriculture is a primary sector in the economies of many African nations.

It is here that we can provide the tools necessary to technologically upgrade agricultural methods and processes.

I have introduced legislation, ''Farmers for Africa Act of 2000,'' which provides these tools.

Farmers from the United States can help!

Our farmers have the tools and skills to help.

They have the ability to train African farmers to use and adopt state-of-the-art farming techniques and agribusiness skills.

In African countries like Mozambique, farmers need our help.

Ravaging flood waters left the lands devastated and thousands homeless and hungry.

Their farmers need help.

Our farmers can help—We ought to help.

Farmers in Zimbabwe need our help.

In that country, thousands of presons have received parcels of land to farm, but do not have the agricultural skills or training to be successful.

These farmers too need our help!

Our farmers can help.

We ought to help!

In Ghana, one of the more stable and productive countries in Africa, farmers there too need our help!

American farmers, through their efficiency in using the most modern and technologically sound agricultural and agribusiness techniques, can help African farmers.

This will not only help boost African crop yields and efficiency to that these nations can produce enough goods to feed themselves, but will also improve the competitiveness of African farmers in the world market.

In addition, through the establishment of partnerships between African and American farmers, we can also create new avenues for delivering goods and services to African countries in need.

The legislation I introduced is designed to establish a bilateral exchange program between Africa and America—one that benefits both continents.

The Bill before us, H.R. 4002 also redefines and updates the roles of American universities who can share information about new farming techniques with similar institutions in other countries.

I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). As I earlier indicated, this legislation is primarily the work of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). He is an outstanding newer Member of the House Committee on International Relations. I would say that I visited the campus of his alma mater this Saturday. They are proud of him, and with this legislation they are going to be even more indebted to him and appreciate his outstanding work.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000. Before I talk about the legislation, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his leadership in this effort. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) for agreeing to be the lead Democrat on this bill and make this truly a bipartisan effort. I also appreciate and commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), their staffs working so well together to ensure this bipartisan legislation could be considered today.

Finally, most importantly, I want to thank one of my constituents, Dr. Ed Price from Texas A&M University, who came to me with the framework for this legislation after working on behalf of the Board of International Food and Agriculture Development, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Without the help of Dr. Price and Texas A&M University, it is unlikely we would be considering this legislation today.

Briefly, Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, which is known as the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act, was enacted in 1975 to increase world food production and to identify solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. According to USAID, the goal to increase world food production has been met. That is the good news. Unfortunately, USAID believes that we have not been as successful at solving the other goal, food and nutrition problems, in developing countries, poorer countries.

Specifically, under H.R. 4002, we address that problem. We broaden the scope of agriculture to reflect a more modern industry, and we expand the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized. We also encourage nongovernmental organizations to work with universities; and these changes, we believe, will result in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development, improved service to the assisted countries, and greater trade and research benefits to us here in America.

This legislation will also help America's agriculture. As Title XII is currently written, we focus on ag research, but this modernization is designed to make extension a more implicit part of Title XII. This will help bring the lessons we learn overseas to our farms, which is important because developing nation markets are the fastest growing markets for U.S. farm products and anything we can do to help speed along their development will help our farmers.

Improved agriculture is necessary to meet the objectives of U.S. foreign assistance, such as improved human health, child survival, democratization, and free enterprise. Furthermore, improving foods for health, flavor and productivity require the assistance of international programs such as those sponsored under Title XII.

Madam Speaker, as the ag industry and our Nation's international development efforts have changed over the past 25 years, the time has come to update this important section to again emphasize the vital role U.S. universities and others can have in our country's international ag development efforts. With over 800 million people worldwide still suffering from inadequate food supplies and associated malnutrition, this update is needed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BRADY, for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation. I, myself, am a strong co-sponsor of this legislation.

H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Improvement Act is long overdue. This bill would update Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, a title which is vitally important to our universities.

Title XII was enacted in 1975 with the goal of increasing world food production and identifying solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. Although the goal to increase world food production has been met, we all know that food and nutrition problems continue to plague much of the developing world.

Since Title XII was enacted, both our agriculture industry and international development efforts have significantly changed. This bill addresses those changes by updating the language under Title XII to reflect a more modern industry and expands the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs, so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized.

Specifically, by expanding the number of eligible participants in Title XII programs, our universities will be able to increase their number of partnerships and play a more significant role in our international agriculture efforts.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to mention that improved agricultural production is essential if the U.S. is to continue fostering democratization around the world, which is one of many important objectives of U.S. foreign assistance. I believe H.R. 4002 addresses this issue.

H.R. 4002 is a win-win for everyone. Internationally, these changes will result in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development (AID), which will improve service to developing countries. Domestically, our country will reap greater trade and research benefits. Moreover, lessons learned through agricultural programs in developing countries will benefit our own agriculture industry.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to seeing this bill become law. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4002.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of H.R. 4002, a bill introduced by Mr. BRADY, the gentleman from Texas, and co-sponsored by Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. DAVIS, all members of the Committee on International Relations. H.R. 4002 seeks to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize the President to establish programs in title XII of the act to encourage the formation of partnerships between land grant universities and non-governmental to promote sustainable agricultural development projects in the world's poorest and neediest countries.

Madam Speaker, although significant strides have been made to increase world food production in recent years, it is clear that more needs to be done to modernize agricultural practices in the developing world and to ensure that sound environmental and conservation practices are applied in rural areas of the world's poorest countries.

As is the case in other development fields, it is sound policy to encourage the formation of partnerships among the public, private, and academic sectors. In the agricultural arena this makes particularly good sense as American technology produces the world's greatest grain yields and can, with the provision of state-of-the-art technical assistance, be applied in developing countries. Moreover, as an added bonus, the lessons learned from these experiences and projects can be brought back home and applied to strengthen our own country's agricultural production.

I commend the sponsors of H.R. 4002 for their efforts to encourage the formation of partnerships between the land-grant university community and non-governmental organizations engaged in agricultural extension work in developing countries and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4002, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE AND SECURITY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4919) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms

Control Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4919

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defense and Security Assistance Act of 2000''.

TITLE I—SECURITY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. ADDITIONS TO UNITED STATES WAR RESERVE STOCKPILES FOR ALLIES.

Section 514(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A) The value of such additions to stockpiles of defense articles in foreign countries shall not exceed $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

''(B) Of the amount specified in subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2001, not more than $50,000,000 may be made available for stockpiles in the Republic of Korea.''.

SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE OR SURPLUS DEFENSE ARTICLES IN THE WAR RESERVE STOCKPILES FOR ALLIES TO ISRAEL.

(a) TRANSFERS TO ISRAEL.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h), the President is authorized to transfer to Israel, in return for concessions to be negotiated by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, any or all of the items described in paragraph (2).

(2) ITEMS COVERED.—The items referred to in paragraph (1) are munitions, equipment, and material such as armor, artillery, automatic weapons ammunition, and missiles that—

(A) are obsolete or surplus items;

(B) are in the inventory of the Department of Defense;

(C) are intended for use as reserve stocks for Israel; and

(D) as of the date of enactment of this Act, are located in a stockpile in Israel.

(b) CONCESSIONS.—The value of concessions negotiated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the items transferred. The concessions may include cash compensation, services, waiver of charges otherwise payable by the United States, and other items of value.

(c) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFER.—Not less than 30 days before making a transfer under the authority of this section, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a notification of the proposed transfer. The notification shall identify the items to be transferred and the concessions to be received.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—No transfer may be made under the authority of this section 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR MONGOLIA.

(a) USES FOR WHICH FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE.—Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)), during each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of that Act to Mongolia.

(b) CONTENT OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Each notification required to be submitted under section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)) with respect to a proposed transfer of a defense article described in subsection (a) shall include an estimate of the amount of funds to be expended under subsection (a) with respect to that transfer.

SEC. 104. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MILITARY EQUIPMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should work with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to enable that Government to procure military equipment that can be used to upgrade the capabilities and to improve the quality of life of the armed forces of the Philippines.

(b) MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—Military equipment described in subsection (a) should include—

(1) naval vessels, including amphibious landing crafts, for patrol, search-and-rescue, and transport;

(2) F–5 aircraft and other aircraft that can assist with reconnaissance, search-and-rescue, and resupply;

(3) attack, transport, and search-and-rescue helicopters; and

(4) vehicles and other personnel equipment.

SEC. 105. ANNUAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE REPORT.

Section 655(b)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415(b)(3)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including those defense articles that were exported''.

SEC. 106. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COUNTRY EXEMPTIONS FOR LICENSING OF DEFENSE ITEMS FOR EXPORT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS OF EXEMPTION.—Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COUNTRY EXEMPTIONS FOR LICENSING OF DEFENSE ITEMS FOR EXPORT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT FOR BILATERAL AGREEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may utilize the regulatory or other authority pursuant to this Act to exempt a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act with respect to exports of defense items only if the United States Government has concluded an agreement described in paragraph (2) with the foreign country that is legally–binding as a matter of domestic and international law on both the United States and that country.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirement to conclude a bilateral agreement in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to an exemption for Canada from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS OF BILATERAL AGREEMENT.—A bilateral agreement referred to paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall, at a minimum, require the foreign country, as necessary, to revise its policies and practices, and promulgate or enact necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to establish an export control regime that is at least comparable to United States law, regulation, and policy regarding—

''(i) handling of all United States-origin defense items exported to the foreign country, including prior written United States Government approval for any reexports to third countries;

''(ii) end-use and retransfer control commitments, including securing binding end-use and retransfer control commitments from all end-users, including such documentation as is needed in order to ensure compliance and enforcement with respect to such United States-origin defense items;

''(iii) establishment of a procedure comparable to a 'watchlist' (if such a watchlist does not exist) and full cooperation with United States Government law enforcement and intelligence agencies to allow for sharing of export and import documentation and background information on foreign businesses and individuals employed by or otherwise connected to those businesses; and

''(iv) establishment of a list of controlled defense items to ensure coverage of those items to be exported under the exemption; and

''(B) should, at a minimum, require the foreign country, as necessary, to revise its policies and practices, and promulgate or enact necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to establish an export control regime that is at least comparable to United States law, regulation, and policy regarding—

''(i) controls on the export of tangible or intangible technology, including via fax, phone, and electronic media;

''(ii) appropriate controls on unclassified information exported to foreign nationals;

''(iii) controls on arms trafficking and brokering; and

''(iv) violations and penalties of export control laws.

''(3) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 30 days before authorizing an exemption for a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items, the President shall transmit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a notification that—

''(A) the United States has entered into a bilateral agreement with that foreign country satisfying all requirements set forth in paragraph (2);

''(B) the foreign country has promulgated or enacted all necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to comply with its obligations under the bilateral agreement with the United States; and

''(C) confirms that the appropriate congressional committees will continue to receive notifications pursuant to the authorities, procedures, and practices of section 36 of this Act for defense exports to a foreign country to which that section would apply and without regard to any form of defense export licensing exemption otherwise available for that country.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(A) DEFENSE ITEM.—The term 'defense item' means defense articles, defense services, and related technical data.

''(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

''(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXEMPTION.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(f)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The President may not authorize an exemption for a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items under subsection (j) or any other provision of this Act until 45 days after the date on which the President has transmitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a notification that includes—

''(A) a description of the scope of the exemption, including a detailed summary of the defense articles, defense services, and related technical data proposed to be exported under the exemption; and

''(B) a determination by the Attorney General that the bilateral agreement requires sufficient documentation relating to the export of United States defense articles, defense services, and related technical data under an exemption which will be compiled and maintained in order to facilitate law enforcement efforts to detect, prevent, and prosecute criminal violations of any provision of this Act, including the efforts on the part of countries and factions engaged in international terrorism to illicitly acquire sophisticated United States weaponry.''.

(c) NOTIFICATION RELATING TO EXPORT OF COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE.—Section 36(c)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting at the end before the period the following: '', except that a certification shall not be required in the case of an application for a license for export of a commercial communications satellite designated on the United States Munitions List for launch from, and by nationals of, the United States, or the territory of a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Australia, Japan, or New Zealand''.

SEC. 107. REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT ARMS SALES END-USE MONITORING PROGRAM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that contains a summary of the status of the efforts of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to implement the End-Use Monitoring Enhancement Plan relating to government-to-government transfers of defense articles, defense services, and related technologies.

SEC. 108. WAIVER OF CERTAIN COSTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may waive the requirement to impose an appropriate charge for a proportionate amount of any nonrecurring costs of research, development, and production under section 21(e)(1)(B) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(e)(1)(B)) for the November 1999 sale of 5 UH–60L helicopters to the Republic of Colombia in support of counternarcotics activities.

TITLE II—TRANSFERS OF NAVAL VESSELS

SEC. 201. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) BRAZIL.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Brazil the ''THOMASTON'' class dock landing ships ALAMO (LSD 33) and HERMITAGE (LSD 34) and the ''GARCIA'' class frigates BRADLEY (FF 1041), DAVIDSON (FF 1045), SAMPLE (FF 1048), and ALBERT DAVID (FF 1050). Such transfers shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(b) CHILE.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of the Chile the ''OLIVER HAZARD PERRY'' class guided missile frigates WADSWORTH (FFG 9) and ESTOCIN (FFG 15). Such transfers shall be on a combined lease-sale basis under sections 61 and 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796, 2761).

(c) GREECE.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Greece the ''KNOX'' class frigates VREELAND (FF 1068) and TRIPPE (FF 1075). Such transfers shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(d) TURKEY.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Turkey the 'OLIVER HAZARD PERRY' class guided missile frigates JOHN A MOORE (FFG 19) and FLATLEY (FFG 21). Such transfers shall be on a combined lease-sale basis under sections 61 and 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796, 2761).

SEC. 202. INAPPLICABILITY OF AGGREGATE ANNUAL LIMITATION ON VALUE OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

In the case of the transfer of a naval vessel authorized under section 201 of this Act to be transferred on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), the value of the vessel transferred shall not be included for purposes of subsection (g) of that section in the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred to countries under that section in any fiscal year.

SEC. 203. COSTS OF TRANSFERS.

Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this title shall be charged to the recipient.

SEC. 204. CONDITIONS RELATING TO COMBINED LEASE-SALE TRANSFERS.

A transfer of a vessel on a combined lease-sale basis authorized by section 201 shall be made in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) The President may initially transfer the vessel by lease, with lease payments suspended for the term of the lease, if the country entering into the lease for the vessel simultaneously enters into a foreign military sales agreement for the transfer of title to the vessel.

(2) The President may not deliver to the purchasing country title to the vessel until the purchase price of the vessel under such a foreign military sales agreement is paid in full.

(3) Upon payment of the purchase price in full under such a sales agreement and delivery of title to the recipient country, the President shall terminate the lease.

(4) If the purchasing country fails to make full payment of the purchase price in accordance with the sales agreement—

(A) the sales agreement shall be immediately terminated;

(B) the suspension of lease payments under the lease shall be vacated; and

(C) the United States shall be entitled to retain all funds received on or before the date of the termination under the sales agreement, up to the amount of lease payments due and payable under the lease and all other costs required by the lease to be paid to that date.

(5) If a sales agreement is terminated pursuant to paragraph (4), the United States shall not be required to pay any interest to the recipient country on any amount paid to the United States by the recipient country under the sales agreement and not retained by the United States under the lease.

SEC. 205. FUNDING OF CERTAIN COSTS OF TRANSFERS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Defense Vessels Transfer Program Account such funds as may be necessary to cover the costs (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of the lease-sale transfers authorized by section 201. Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under preceding sentence for the purpose described in such sentence may not be available for any other purpose.

SEC. 206. REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.

To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under section 201, that the country to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

SEC. 207. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS ON A GRANT BASIS.

It is the sense of Congress that naval vessels authorized under section 201 of this Act to be transferred to foreign countries on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) should be so transferred only if the United States receives appropriate benefits from such countries for transferring the vessel on a grant basis.

SEC. 208. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.

The authority granted by section 201 of this Act shall expire 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4919.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises in support of H.R. 4919, the Defense and Security Assistance Act of 2000.

This legislation modifies authorities with respect to the provision of security assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act. It is authored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who was unavoidably detained and could not be here today for this legislation.

Most of the provisions have been requested by the administration. Specifically, these provisions address the transfer of excess defense articles, notification requirements for arms sales and authorities to provide for the stockpiling of defense articles in foreign countries. The bill also includes an important bipartisan provision to address the administration's initiative regarding exemptions for defense export licenses to foreign countries.

This Member wishes to thank the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), for his cooperation on these provisions, as well as the NGO community for their hard work.

In addition, this bill authorizes the transfer of two Naval vessels to Chile and provides authority to the President to convert existing leases for 10 ships which have already been transferred to Brazil, Greece, and Turkey.

This Member is pleased to note that this body has successfully enacted into law, over the past 4 years, each of our bills addressing security assistance matters. It is the hope of this Member that the legislative branch is able to continue this record with approval of this measure, H.R. 4919.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4919, in order to assist the committee. This bill is an annual authorization for certain activities related to the U.S. assistance for national defense of our friends and allies overseas. The bill authorizes the President to transfer obsolete U.S. ships to friendly countries either through grants or sale/lease arrangements to support their legitimate defense needs. These ships have reached or exceeded their service life and would cost considerable amount for the U.S. to refurbish them or scrap them.

□ 1445

Transferring most of these ships will serve our foreign policy interests. The bill authorized transfer of obsolete U.S. defense equipment and other articles to the stockpiles of South Korea and Israel. These transfers directly support the U.S. plans for the defense of Korea as well as increasing the capacity and readiness of the South Korean and Israeli forces to defend themselves.

Madam Speaker, I believe the bill was quite well summarized by the gentleman from Nebraska. I should point out that I will personally have some concerns with title II of the bill, in particular subsection D of section 201 of the act, which as I may have mentioned is part of title II. But to facilitate the work of this House and of the committee, I stand in support of H.R. 4919.

Madam Speaker, seeing no requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in closing I want to recognize the fact this legislation includes two important priorities of this Member as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. The first is section 103 which relates to excess defense articles to be provided to Mongolia.

Additionally, there is a sense of the Congress expressed in section 104 related to our work with the Republic of the Philippines with respect to the procurement of military equipment, and I am pleased to see those provisions included.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, this bill modifies authorities with respect to the provision of security assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act. Most of the provisions have been requested by the administration. Specifically, these provisions address the transfer of excess defense articles, notification requirements for arms sales and authorities to provide for the stockpiling of defense articles in foreign countries. The bill also includes an important bipartisan provision to address the administration's initiative regarding exemptions for defense export licensing to foreign countries. I want to thank the ranking Democrat member for his cooperation on this provision as well as the NGO community for their hard work.

The provision in question here goes to the heart of our jurisdiction and role as an authorizing committee. For the past year and a half the administration fought internally to resolve the question of whether we should provide exemptions from licensing for defense exports to foreign countries. The State Department fought the exemption all the way up to the President. They opposed it at the deputies level. They opposed it at the principals level. They opposed it until the President sided with the Department of Defense and overruled them. Now the State Department is putting on its game face and saying the administration is all one big happy family. That's their story and they are sticking to it.

Now it is time for the Congress to have its say. As most of you know, I have not been an enthusiastic supporter of new International Traffic in Arm Regulations [ITAR] exemptions. I believe that the Arms Export Control Act [AECA] provides the appropriate structure under which the United States should continue to advance our foreign policy, national security and non-proliferation interests. Moreover, it is absolutely clear that State Department regulations and practice in implementing U.S. munitions laws, including the AECA, have long provided for individual, case-by-case licenses for defense exports.

Further, it is my view that any decision to extend exemptions should only be made when the recipient countries have in place an export control system comparable to that in the United States. This means that such exemptions shall only be provided if a country has provided assurances in a legally binding fashion that details how such a country will enact export control procedures that sufficiently conform to those of the United States and has drafted, promulgated and enacted necessary modifications to its laws and regulations.

I have applied this rationale in fashioning section 108 of this bill. We require a legally binding bilateral agreement. We list the overall requirements of what should be in the bilateral agreement but require only that certain of those requirements be certified. We then require a separate notification detailing the scope of the proposed exemption. This is a reasonable compromise on this issue. It allows the administration to proceed with exemptions but requires that it is done in a fashion that does not undercut our current practices and policies and preserves the rationale and logic of the AECA. Now the Department of Defense and some in the defense industry would tell you that real problems would emerge if this language is agreed to. They argue that no country will ever agree to modify their export control laws and practices to protect U.S. defense exports as we do in the United States.

That is not exactly correct. Let me explain. Everyone should understand that section 108 requires nothing more than what the Pentagon has already said it is willing to do. They agree there should be bilateral agreement. They agree it should be legally binding. The agree there should be end-use and retransfer assurances. They agree that there should be harmonization of export control lists and penalties for violations. They agree that this initiative should only be applied to countries that adopt and demonstrate export controls and technology security systems that are comparable in scope and effectiveness to those of the United States.

What they don't agree with is that we, the Congress, should codify the requirements. I disagree with that position and believe that this provision protects what is embodied in the AECA. The administration argues that the scope of this exemption should not be troubling. They argue that it applies only to unclassified exports. Let's consider that for a moment. Let's be sure that everyone understands this point.

Last year the Office of Defense Trade Controls processed over 45,000 licenses; 45,058 to be exact. Guess how many of those involved classified exports. 258. That's right. That means that 99.995 percent of the license amounting to over $25 billion were for unclassified exports.

Now let's consider what kind of weapons systems are deemed unclassified. One example is an armored personnel carrier [APC]. This is a good example because a couple of years ago Canada transferred United States-provided APCs to Iran. Guess how we provided them to Canada. Under an exemption. That's why, in part, the State Department yanked their exemption and Canada is still trying to get it back. Another example. F–16s. Unclassified except for the technology incorporated in the nose cone. And my personal favorite. Super cobra attack helicopters. Under the exemption that administration could transfer any of these weapons systems to a foreign country.

That is why we need countries to agree to control our defense exports like we do. We don't want defense items provided under an exemption to wind up in the hands of our enemies. I would also like to note that the Justice Department has raised its concerns about the effect of the exemption on its efforts to ensure that it will not impede the ability of the law enforcement community to detect, prevent and prosecute criminal violations of the AECA. Further they have concerns that the exemption may facilitate efforts on the part of countries and factions engaged in international terrorism to illicitly acquire sophisticated U.S. weaponry.

Accordingly, this provision requires a determination by the Attorney General that any bilateral agreement negotiated between the United States and a foreign country include sufficient documentation on defense items provided under the exemption so that our law enforcement agencies can ensure compliance and enforcement with our laws. In addition this bill authorizes the transfer of two naval vessels to Chile and provides authority to the President to convert existing leases for 10 ships which have already been transferred to Brazil, Greece, and Turkey. I am pleased to

note that we have successfully enacted into law over the past 4 years each of our bills addressing security assistance matters. I hope we are able to continue our record with this measure.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4919.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEAS OF NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG RECOVERY MONTH

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 371) supporting the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 371

Whereas 26 million Americans currently suffer the ravages of drug or alcohol addiction;

Whereas 85 percent of all crimes are tied to drug or alcohol addiction;

Whereas American taxpayers incurred more than $150 billion in drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone—more than they spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined;

Whereas every dollar invested in drug and alcohol treatment yields seven dollars in savings in health care costs, criminal justice costs, and lost productivity costs from job absenteeism, injuries, and subpar work performance;

Whereas treatment for addiction is as effective as treatments for other chronic medical conditions, such as diabetes and high blood pressure;

Whereas adolescents who undergo addiction treatment report less use of marijuana, less heavy drinking, and less criminal involvement;

Whereas other benefits of adolescent addiction treatment include better psychological adjustment and improved school performance after treatment;

Whereas a number of organizations and individuals dedicated to fighting addiction and promoting treatment and recovery will recognize September 2000 as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month;

Whereas National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month celebrates the tremendous strides taken by individuals who have undergone successful treatment and recognizes those in the treatment field who have dedicated their lives to helping people recover from addiction; and

Whereas the 2000 national campaign focuses on supporting adolescents in addiction treatment and recovery, embraces the theme of ''Recovering Our Future: One Youth at a Time'', and seeks to increase awareness about alcohol and drug addiction and to promote treatment and recovery for adolescents and adults: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress supports the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 371.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me this time, and for his strong effective leadership in this area.

Madam Speaker, I stand before this body today as a personal testament to the fact that chemical dependency treatment works. As a grateful recovering alcoholic of 19 years, I know firsthand the value of treatment and the blessings of recovery. So with deep humility and much gratitude, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

For a number of years, several organizations and people dedicated to addiction treatment and recovery have recognized September as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. This September, special attention will focus on adolescents, young people dealing with addiction, and the theme will be ''Recovering Our Future: One Youth at a Time.''

As a Nation, Madam Speaker, we must recover our future by addressing addiction. We must recover our youth one young person at a time.

The tragic reality is that today in America 26 million people are addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. Twenty-six million Americans suffer the ravages of addiction. This disease, Madam Speaker, is afflicting people of all ages. Among youth ages 12 to 17, an estimated 1.1 million; ages 12 to 17, 1.1 million young people are dependent on illicit drugs. Another 1 million young people ages 12 to 17, are addicted to alcohol.

Young people ages 16 and 17 have the second highest rate of drug use in the country today, second only to people ages 18 to 20. And by the time these young people reach 17 years of age, over one-half of all young people know a drug dealer. Madam Speaker, over one-half of all people by the time they reach 17 know some drug dealer in America.

In 1999, more than half of our Nation's 12th graders use drugs and more than one-quarter used a drug other than marijuana. In other words, a so-called hard drug. And although alcohol consumption is illegal in this country for those under 21, some 10.5 million juveniles between the ages of 12 and 20 are consumers of alcohol.

Madam Speaker, addiction is truly a crisis of epidemic proportions in America. Addiction is the number one health and crime problem facing our country. Alcohol and drug addiction, in economic terms alone, cost the American people last year $246 billion. That is billion with a ''B.'' American taxpayers paid over $150 billion for drug-related criminal and medical costs alone; more than they spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined.

But, Madam Speaker, it does not have to be this way. The future of our children and the future of millions of other Americans can be saved, can be recovered. Like other diseases, addiction can be treated and all the empirical data done show that treatment for addiction works.

In 1956, the American Medical Association told the American people that chemical addiction is a disease and a fatal disease if not properly treated. In fact, leading physicians at that time found that chemical addiction conforms to the expectations for chronic illness and that relapse rates after treatment for addiction compare favorably with those for three other chronic diseases: adult on-set diabetes, hypertension, and adult asthma. The relapse rates for people treated for chemical addiction is essentially the same as those three diseases.

It is well documented that every dollar spent for treatment saves $7 in health care costs, criminal justice costs and lost productivity from job absenteeism, injuries and sub-par work performance.

A number of studies have shown that health care costs alone are 100 percent higher for untreated alcoholics and addicts than for people like me, recovering people who have received treatment.

Madam Speaker, the goal of this resolution is to increase awareness about alcohol and drug addiction and promote treatment and recovery for more people, more people who are suffering the ravages of alcohol and drug addiction. Increasing awareness about the ravages of addiction is absolutely critical. How can it be that among 12th graders in America, less than two-thirds find anything wrong with smoking marijuana?

Equally alarming, only 47 percent of adolescents between 12 and 17 believe that having five or more drinks once or twice a week is any risk at all. Only two-thirds believe that having four or five drinks every day is a problem. We must increase awareness as well as access to treatment for young people.

Despite the benefits of treatment, a significant gap in this country exists between the number of adolescents who need chemical dependency treatment

and those who actually receive it. According to a study done in my home State of Minnesota, a State that has led the Nation in the treatment and prevention of addiction, only one-fourth of youths ages 14 to 17 who need treatment actually are able to access treatment.

Madam Speaker, let me close by saying that commemorating recovery month gives all of us an opportunity to recognize the tremendous strides taken by those who have undergone treatment and the professionals in the treatment field who have dedicated their lives to helping others. By celebrating recovery month, we celebrate the lives of the millions of people and their families in recovery today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 371.

Madam Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me this time and for his strong, effective leadership in combating addiction and in recognizing and promoting treatment and prevention of addiction.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 371, which expresses the support of the goals and the ideas of the National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month. As may be mentioned, September is National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month, and it is certainly a powerful message to hear the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) speak of his own recovery from addiction. I think we should join in commending him for the courage that he displays in sharing his message of recovery from addiction. It should give encouragement to all who fight to overcome addiction in a similar manner.

This powerful message which we hope to send today, that substance abuse treatment is effective and that recovery reclaims lives, is a very important message to send to the American people. Providing effective treatment to those who need it is critical to breaking the cycle of addiction, violence, despair and to helping addicted individuals become productive members of society.

This is an opportunity for all of us to recognize the tremendous strides taken by all individuals who have undergone successful treatment and to salute those who have worked with those individuals so tirelessly and have dedicated their lives to helping people with problems of addiction.

This month celebrates the work of policymakers, Federal, State, and local government entities, business leaders, substance abuse providers and the public. This is an opportunity for all of us to recommit ourselves to the task of substance abuse treatment and recovery.

Substance abuse does cost American businesses and industries millions of dollars every year, and it has a profound negative effect in the workplace. Contrary to popular opinion, most illegal substance abusers work on the job every day. In fact the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration has found that nearly 73 percent of all illegal drug users in this country are employed. Lost productivity, high employee turnover, low employee morale, mistakes and accidents, increased Workers' Compensation insurance and health insurance premiums are all the results of untreated substance abuse problems in the workplace.

September, designated as recovery month, also highlights the benefits to be gained from corporate and small business workplace substance abuse referral programs. H. Con. Res 371 makes us all aware that recovery from substance abuse is possible and that supporting treatment for addicted individuals increases productivity, improves morale, is important to success in business, and most importantly, preserves and protects the quality of life for the addicted individual and their families.

□ 1500

I join with the author of this bill and with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) in support of this resolution to salute those who work with the addicted in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) who has been immensely helpful in this and all the other resolutions that come out of the Subcommittee of Government Management, Information and Technology.

When one looks at the cost here of $150 billion a year in drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone, and that is more than we spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined; and when one thinks that we could fill a stadium on a Saturday afternoon for a football team, that number of people would be wiped out by drunk drivers.

This treatment is possible. We see the wonderful work that Alcoholics Anonymous does and the other treatment programs. It is so important. We need to discuss it in people's homes. We need to discuss it in the villages, the towns, the cities, because this is the type of thing that needs the human touch, where people say we care about you and something should be done to help you.

Generally that works, but often they fall off the wagon, as the saying goes, and then thousands of people are injured, hurt, die as a result of these victims.

The saddest, of course, is when one sees young people at their high school prom or something and then a fellow student rams into them and they never have a chance to graduate and they never have a chance to go and provide the opportunities for themselves in this world.

So let me urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. The resolution of H. Con. Res. 371 by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) hopefully will get a few people to be helpful in this area and maybe save many people.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 371.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4110) to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4110

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION.

Section 2504(f)(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (K), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(L) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

''(M) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

''(N) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(O) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4110.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4110 would allow the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to continue its valuable work in helping to preserve the records of our Nation's history.

Since its formation in 1934, the commission, affiliated with the National Archives and Records Administration, has complemented National Archives' work in protecting vital American documents.

Unlike the National Archives, which maintains Federal records, the commission assists non-Federal historical societies, nonprofit organizations, universities, and State and local governments.

In 1964, the commission began funding independent archival projects through its grants program, which provide an invaluable service to the Nation through the maintenance of its historical records. These projects include family papers, manuscripts, and other electronic records. The commission has been instrumental in preserving the historical works of such great American leaders as George Washington, John Adams, Henry Clay, and Martin Luther King, Jr.

Last November, the commission awarded grants for 64 projects, totalling $3 million. In addition, it proposed funding a 3-year, $1.8 million initiative to help raise the level of archival expertise in the rapidly changing area of electronic record keeping.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is the only national grant-making organization in the Nation whose sole focus is the preservation and publication of America's documentary history. The 15-member commission supports the professional development of archivists, documentary editors, and record keepers through fellowships, institutes, conferences, workshops, and other programs.

In addition, the commission has undertaken a number of projects that focus on the records of underdocumented groups, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and other ethnic and interest groups, such as the large Hispanic population in the United States, and various other social and political movements.

H.R. 4110 would reauthorize the appropriation of $10 million, the same amount authorized for fiscal year 2001, for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

On April 4, 2000, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, on which the gentleman form Texas (Mr. TURNER) and I serve, held a legislative hearing on H.R. 4110. On April 5, 2000, the subcommittee marked up the bill by a voice vote and referred it to the full Committee on Government Reform. On May 18, 2000, the Committee on Government Reform, by voice vote, ordered the bill favorably reported to the House for its consideration.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4110, the legislation to reauthorize the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. This commission is the grant-making arm of the National Archives. It is charged with a very important role of preserving non-Federal records.

Every year grants are made to State and local governments, universities, libraries, historical societies, and other nonprofit institutions for the purpose of preserving important historical documents for years to come.

The Congress created this commission in the 1930s because it understood and recognized the importance of preserving American history, not only within the Beltway, but all across this United States. Proper and accurate historical documentation is essential to recording the history of our great democracy.

This commission has had an important job, and I am pleased to join with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) in cosponsoring this legislation which will reauthorize this appropriation through the year 2005.

The papers, the manuscripts and other artifacts preserved by grants from this commission define who we are as a people and as a Nation.

I want to commend Governor John Carlin, our National Archivist, for his leadership in this area. The former Governor of Kansas has done an outstanding job leading at the National Archives, and this grant program is one of the most effective tools that we have to continue the fine tradition of those who have worked diligently at the National Archives over our many years of history to be sure that we, as a Nation, preserve those things that are important to our heritage.

It is a pleasure for me to join with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN), and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 4110.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4110, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT OF 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1800) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to ensure that certain information regarding prisoners is reported to the Attorney General, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1800

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. REPORTING OF INFORMATION.

Section 20104(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13704(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(1)''; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(B)'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(C)'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) such State has provided assurances that it will follow guidelines established by the Attorney General in reporting, on a quarterly basis, information regarding the death of any person who is in the process of arrest, is en route to be incarcerated, or is incarcerated at a municipal or county jail, State prison, or other local or State correctional facility (including any juvenile facility) that, at a minimum, includes—

''(A) the name, gender, race, ethnicity, and age of the deceased;

''(B) the date, time, and location of death; and

''(C) a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the death.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1800.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his work on this bill. We have both been advocating this proposal for many years, and I am pleased that today we are one step

closer to bringing a new level of accountability to our Nation's correctional institutions, our prisons, in those instances in which individuals pass away while they are in custody.

H.R. 1800 is called the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2000. It ensures that States report the deaths of individuals who die in custody, whether it be State or local. The bill requires each State that receives Truth in Sentencing funding to report on a quarterly basis the number of and circumstances surrounding deaths that occur during arrest and incarceration.

An estimated 1,000 men and women die questionable deaths each year while in police custody or in jail. An investigative article in the Asbury Park Press of New Jersey reported that a number of deaths which occur in State and local jails are listed as suicides but that such conclusions are often tainted by inadequate record keeping, investigative incompetence, and physical evidence that suggest otherwise. In addition, the study found that many of the individuals listed as suicides have been arrested for relatively minor offenses, reducing the likelihood that they would take their own lives.

One teenage boy who was found dead by hanging in an Arkansas jail had been arrested for a failure to pay a fine for underage drinking. Another individual in an Arkansas jail was found suffocated by toilet paper stuffed down his throat. No records exist as to why he was in custody, according to the Asbury Park Press story.

In any other atmosphere, unnatural deaths under questionable circumstances would not only be reported but would raise serious concerns. State and local jails and lockups should be no different. This legislation will provide openness in government and will bolster public confidence and trust in our judicial system. In addition, I believe that it will serve as a deterrent to future misconduct by wrongdoers who will know that someone will be monitoring their actions.

Three years ago, the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act directed the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice to determine the feasibility of creating a single source for annual statistics on in-custody deaths, including Federal, State and local incidents.

In March of 1998, the Department of Justice reported that this goal is achievable. Currently, statistics are gathered on an annual and a voluntary basis for Federal and State deaths and on a 5-year voluntary basis for county and local jails.

This bill directs the Attorney General to develop guidelines for the reporting of deaths in custody; and it requires that, at a minimum, the report include the name of the deceased, the gender of the deceased, the race and ethnicity of the deceased, the age of the deceased, the date and time and location of the death, and a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the death.

The House Committee on Judiciary unanimously approved a similar provision as an amendment to H.R. 1659, the National Police Training Commission Act of 1999; but that bill has not been considered by the House.

Madam Speaker, I am offering a manager's amendment that makes some minor changes to the bill. The amendment has been cleared with the minority, and I am not aware of any opposition to the amendment.

The amendment simply changes the statutory cite to ensure this legislation amends the correct portion of the Code, and it adds process of arrest to the factors that must be reported about the deceased individual; and it includes a brief description surrounding the circumstances of death as part of the reporting requirement.

I strongly believe that the data gathered under this act will provide us with a better understanding about our Nation's correctional system, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) in commending H.R. 1800, the Death In Custody Act of 2000, to the Members of the House.

□ 1515

We have worked together in developing this issue for the past 5 years, and I even worked with Senator TIM HUTCHINSON from Arkansas on this issue when he was a Member of the House.

This bill simply requires that deaths in State and local police custody be reported to the attorney general. A similar measure was adopted by the House on a voice vote without opposition in the 1995 Crime Bill, but it was adjusted in conference to simply require this Department of Justice to study the feasibility of requiring localities to report deaths in custody. The Department has now said that reporting deaths in custody is feasible. Of course, I would hate to think that there are any jurisdictions with so many deaths in custody that it would not be feasible to report them.

Dating back to my experiences as a State legislator, I have always been concerned that there was no national system for accounting for deaths in law enforcement custody. As detailed in an exhaustive, year-long investigative report by the Asbury Press in New Jersey, about 1,000 such deaths occur each year. Many of these deaths occur under suspicious circumstances. While most are listed as ''suicides,'' many, the Asbury Press reports, are ''tainted with racial overtones, good-ole-boy conspiracies and coverups, or investigative incompetence.'' The problem is that, with no one looking at these deaths from a systematic point of view, we do not know whether there is any pattern or practice relating to such deaths nor whether there is any training needed amongst law enforcement officials which could limit such occurrences or anything else.

In fact, without such information, the debate on the issue is relegated to: ''There's a problem; No, there isn't; Yes, there is,'' with both sides yelling at each other and little or no actual information being the basis of the discussion.

Regular reports of deaths in custody will allow us to get a handle on the nature and extent of what I believe to be a serious problem; we just do not know the extent. Let us hope that, at a minimum, the knowledge that a report is required to the Justice Department of all deaths in custody, and something brief about their circumstances, will discourage the misconduct, or questionable conduct, against those in custody by their custodians. And, furthermore, to the extent there may be common elements to these deaths, we will be in a much better position to prevent them in the future.

This is a modest proposal, and I urge Members of the House to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1800, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4700) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONSENT TO COMPACT.

The Congress consents to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact entered into between the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri. The compact reads substantially as follows:

''KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

''ARTICLE I. AGREEMENT AND PLEDGE

''The states of Kansas and Missouri agree to and pledge, each to the other, faithful cooperation in the future planning and development of the metropolitan culture district,

holding in high trust for the benefit of this people and of the nation, the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

''ARTICLE II. POLICY AND PURPOSE

''The party states, desiring by common action to fully utilize and improve their cultural facilities, coordinate the services of their cultural organizations, enhance the cultural activities of their citizens, and achieve solid financial support for such cultural facilities, organizations and activities, declare that it is the policy of each state to realize such desires on a basis of cooperation with one another, thereby serving the best interests of their citizenry and effecting economies in capital expenditures and operational costs. The purpose of this compact is to provide for the creation of a metropolitan culture district as the means to implementation of the policy herein declared with the most beneficial and economical use of human and material resources.

''ARTICLE III. DEFINITIONS

''As used in this compact, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

''(a) 'Metropolitan culture district' means a political subdivision of the states of Kansas and Missouri which is created under and pursuant to the provisions of this compact and which is composed of the counties in the states of Kansas and Missouri which act to create or to become a part of the district in accordance with the provisions of Article IV.

''(b) 'Commission' means the governing body of the metropolitan culture district.

''(c) 'Cultural activities' means sports or activities which contribute to or enhance the aesthetic, artistic, historical, intellectual or social development or appreciation of members of the general public.

''(d) 'Cultural organizations' means nonprofit and tax exempt social, civic or community organizations and associations which are dedicated to the development, provision, operation, supervision, promotion or support of cultural activities in which members of the general public may engage or participate.

''(e) 'Cultural facilities' means facilities operated or used for sports or participation or engagement in cultural activities by members of the general public.

''ARTICLE IV. THE DISTRICT

''(a) The counties in Kansas and Missouri eligible to create and initially compose the metropolitan culture district shall be those counties which meet one or more of the following criteria:

''(1) The county has a population in excess of 300,000, and is adjacent to the state line;

''(2) The county contains a part of a city with a population according to the most recent federal census of at least 400,000; or

''(3) The county is contiguous to any county described in provisions (1) or (2) of this subpart (a). The counties of Johnson in Kansas and Jackson in Missouri shall be sine qua non to the creation and initial composition of the district. Additional counties in Kansas and Missouri shall be eligible to become a part of the metropolitan culture district if such counties are contiguous to any one or more of the counties which compose the district and within 60 miles of the counties that are required by this article to establish the district;

''(b)(1) Whenever the governing body of any county which is eligible to create or become a part of the metropolitan culture district shall determine that creation of or participation in the district is in the best interests of the citizens of the county and that the levy of a tax to provide on a cooperative basis with another county or other counties for financial support of the district would be economically practical and cost beneficial to the citizens of the county, the governing body may adopt by majority vote a resolution authorizing the same.

''(2) Wherever a petition, signed by not less than the number of qualified electors of an eligible county equal to 5% of the number of ballots cast and counted at the last preceding gubernatorial election held in the county and requesting adoption of a resolution authorizing creation of or participation in the metropolitan culture district and the levy of a tax for the purpose of contributing to the financial support of the district, is filed with the governing body of the county, the governing body shall adopt such a resolution.

''(3) Implementation of a resolution adopted under this subpart (b) shall be conditioned upon approval of the resolution by a majority of the qualified electors of the county voting at an election conducted for such purpose.

''(c)(1) Upon adoption of a resolution pursuant to subpart (b)(1) or subpart (b)(2), the governing body of the county shall request, within 36 months after adoption of the resolution, the county election officer to submit to the qualified electors of the county the question of whether the governing body shall be authorized to implement the resolution. The resolution shall be printed on the ballot and in the notice of election. The question shall be submitted to the electors of the county at the primary or general election next following the date of the request filed with the county election officer. If a majority of the qualified electors are opposed to implementation of the resolution authorizing creation of, or participation in, the district and the levy of a tax for financial support thereof, the same shall not be implemented. The governing body of the county may review procedures for authorization to create or become a part of the district and to levy a tax for financial support thereof at any time following rejection of the question.

''(2) The ballot for the proposition in any county shall be in substantially the following form:

''Shall a retail sales tax of _____ (insert amount, not to exceed ¼ cent) be levied and collected in Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district consisting of the county(ies) of _____ (insert name of counties) for the support of cultural facilities and organizations within the district?

YES NO

The governing body of the county may place additional language on the ballot to describe the use or allocation of the funds.

''(d)(1) The metropolitan culture district shall be created when implementation of a resolution authorizing the creation of the district and the levy of a tax for contribution to the financial support thereof is approved by respective majorities of the qualified electors of at least Johnson County, Kansas, and Jackson County, Missouri.

''(2) When implementation of a resolution authorizing participation in the metropolitan culture district and the levy of a tax for contribution to the financial support thereof is approved by a majority of the qualified electors of any county eligible to become a part of the district, the governing body of the county shall proceed with the performance of all things necessary and incidental to participation in the district.

''(3) Any question for the levy of a tax submitted after July 1, 2000, may be submitted to the electors of the county at the primary or general election next following the date of the request filed with the county election officer; at a special election called and held as otherwise provided by law; at an election called and held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in February, except in Presidential election years; at an election called and held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March, June, August, or November; or at an election called and held on the first Tuesday in April, except that no question for a tax levy may be submitted to the electors prior to January 1, 2002.

''(4) No question shall be submitted to the electors authorizing the levy of a tax the proceeds of which will be exclusively dedicated to sports or sports facilities.

''(e) Any of the counties composing the metropolitan culture district may withdraw from the district by adoption of a resolution and approval of the resolution by a majority of the qualified electors of the county, all in the same manner provided in this Article IV for creating or becoming a part of the metropolitan culture district. The governing body of a withdrawing county shall provide for the sending of formal written notice of withdrawal from the district to the governing body of the other county or each of the other counties comprising the district. Actual withdrawal shall not take effect until 90 days after notice has been sent. A withdrawing county shall not be relieved from any obligation which such county may have assumed or incurred by reason of being a part of the district, including, but not limited to, the retirement of any outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district.

''ARTICLE V. THE COMMISSION

''(a) The metropolitan culture district shall be governed by the metropolitan culture commission which shall be a body corporate and politic and which shall be composed of resident electors of the states of Kansas and Missouri, respectively, as follows:

''(1) A member of the governing body of each county which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

''(2) A member of the governing body of each city, with a population according to the most recent federal census of at least 50,000, located in whole or in part within each county which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

''(3) Two members of the governing body of a county with a consolidated or unified county government and city of the first class which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

''(4) A member of the arts commission of Kansas or the Kansas commission for the humanities, who shall be appointed by the governor of Kansas; and

''(5) A member of the arts commission of Missouri or the Missouri humanities council, who shall be appointed by the governor of Missouri.

To the extent possible, the gubernatorial appointees to the commission shall be residents of the district. The term of each commissioner initially appointed by a county governing body shall expire concurrently with such commissioner's tenure as a county officer or three years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner succeeding a commissioner initially appointed by a county governing body shall expire concurrently with such successor commissioner's tenure as a county officer or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner initially appointed by a city governing body shall expire concurrently with such commissioner's tenure as a city officer or two years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner succeeding a commissioner

initially appointed by a city governing body shall expire concurrently with such successor commissioner's tenure as a city officer or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner appointed by the governor of Kansas or the governor of Missouri shall expire concurrently with the term of the appointing governor, the commissioner's tenure as a state officer, or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner of the district, whichever occurs sooner. Any vacancy occurring in a commissioner position for reasons other than expiration of terms of office shall be filled for the unexpired term by appointment in the same manner that the original appointment was made. Any commissioner may be removed for cause by the appointing authority of the commissioner.

''(b) The commission shall select annually, from its membership, a chairperson, a vice chairperson, and a treasurer. The treasurer shall be bonded in such amounts as the commission may require.

''(c) The commission may appoint such officers, agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, and shall determine the qualifications and duties and fix the compensation of such officers, agents and employees.

''(d) The commission shall fix the time and place at which its meetings shall be held. Meetings shall be held within the district and shall be open to the public. Public notice shall be given of all meetings.

''(e) A majority of the commissioners from each state shall constitute, in the aggregate, a quorum for the transaction of business. No action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least a quorum is present, and unless a majority of the commissioners from each state, present at such meeting, shall vote in favor thereof. No action of the commission taken at a meeting thereof shall be binding unless the subject of such action is included in a written agenda for such meeting, the agenda and notice of meeting having been mailed to each commissioner by postage paid first-class mail at least 14 calendar days prior to the meeting.

''(f) The commissioners from each state shall be subject to the provisions of the laws of the states of Kansas and Missouri, respectively, which relate to conflicts of interest of public officers and employees. If any commissioner has a direct or indirect financial interest in any cultural facility, organization or activity supported by the district or commission or in any other business transaction of the district or commission, the commissioner shall disclose such interest in writing to the other commissioners and shall abstain from voting on any matter relating to such facility, organization or activity or to such business transaction.

''(g) If any action at law or equity, or other legal proceeding, shall be brought against any commissioner for any act or omission arising out of the performance of duties as a commissioner, the commissioner shall be indemnified in whole and held harmless by the commission for any judgment or decree entered against the commissioner and, further, shall be defended at the cost and expense of the commission in any such proceeding.

''ARTICLE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

''(a) The commission shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws governing its management and procedure.

''(b) The commission has the power to contract and to be contracted with, and to sue and to be sued.

''(c) The commission may receive for any of its purposes and functions any contributions or moneys appropriated by counties or cities and may solicit and receive any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services from any state or the United States or any agency thereof, or from any institution, foundation, organization, person, firm or corporation, and may utilize and dispose of the same.

''(d) Upon receipt of recommendations from the advisory committee provided in subsection (g), the commission may provide donations, contributions and grants or other support, financial or otherwise, or in aid of cultural organizations, facilities or activities in counties which are part of the district. In determining whether to provide any such support the commission shall consider the following factors:

''(1) economic impact upon the district;

''(2) cultural benefit to citizens of the district and to the general public;

''(3) contribution to the quality of life and popular image of the district;

''(4) contribution to the geographical balance of cultural facilities and activities within and outside the district;

''(5) the breadth of popular appeal within and outside the district;

''(6) the needs of the community as identified in an objective cultural needs assessment study of the metropolitan area; and

''(7) any other factor deemed appropriate by the commission.

''(e) The commission may own and acquire by gift, purchase, lease or devise cultural facilities within the territory of the district. The commission may plan, construct, operate and maintain and contract for the operation and maintenance of cultural facilities within the territory of the district. The commission may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of cultural facilities within the territory of the district.

''(f) At any time following five years from and after the creation of the metropolitan cultural district as provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of article IV, the commission may borrow moneys for the planning, construction, equipping, operation, maintenance, repair, extension, expansion, or improvement of any cultural facility and, in that regard, the commission at such time may:

''(1) issue notes, bonds or other instruments in writing of the commission in evidence of the sum or sums to be borrowed. No notes, bonds or other instruments in writing shall be issued pursuant to this subsection until the issuance of such notes, bonds or instruments has been submitted to and approved by a majority of the qualified electors of the district voting at an election called and held thereon. Such election shall be called and held in the manner provided by law;

''(2) issue refunding notes, bonds or other instruments in writing for the purpose of refunding, extending or unifying the whole or any part of its outstanding indebtedness from time to time whether evidenced by notes, bonds or other instruments in writing. Such refunding notes, bonds or other instruments in writing shall not exceed in amount the principal of the outstanding indebtedness to be refunded and the accrued interest thereon to the date of such refunding;

''(3) provide that all notes, bonds and other instruments in writing issued hereunder shall or may be payable, both as to principal and interest, from sales tax revenues authorized under this compact and disbursed to the district by counties comprising the district, admissions and other revenues collected from the use of any cultural facility or facilities constructed hereunder, or from any other resources of the commission, and further may be secured by a mortgage or deed of trust upon any property interest of the commission; and

''(4) prescribe the details of all notes, bonds or other instruments in writing, and of the issuance and sale thereof. The commission shall have the power to enter into covenants with the holders of such notes, bonds or other instruments in writing, not inconsistent with the powers granted herein, without further legislative authority.

''(g) The commission shall appoint an advisory committee composed of members of the general public consisting of an equal number of persons from both the states of Kansas and Missouri who have demonstrated interest, expertise, knowledge or experience in cultural organizations or activities. The advisory committee shall make recommendations annually to the commission regarding donations, contributions and grants or other support, financial or otherwise, for or in aid of cultural organizations, facilities and activities in counties which are part of the district.

''(h) The commission may provide for actual and necessary expenses of commissioners and advisory committee members incurred in the performance of their official duties.

''(i) The commission shall cause to be prepared annually a report on the operations and transactions conducted by the commission during the preceding year. The report shall be submitted to the legislatures and governors of the compacting states, to the governing bodies of the counties comprising the district, and to the governing body of each city that appoints a commissioner. The commission shall publish the annual report in the official county newspaper of each of the counties comprising the district.

''(j) The commission has the power to apply to the congress of the United States for its consent and approval of the compact. In the absence of the consent of congress and until consent is secured, the compact is binding upon the states of Kansas and Missouri in all respects permitted by law for the two states, without the consent of congress, for the purposes enumerated and in the manner provided in the compact.

''(k) The commission has the power to perform all other necessary and incidental functions and duties and to exercise all other necessary and appropriate powers not inconsistent with the constitution or laws of the United States or of either of the states of Kansas or Missouri to effectuate the same.

''ARTICLE VII. FINANCE

''(a) The moneys necessary to finance the operation of the metropolitan culture district and the execution of the powers, duties and responsibilities of the commission shall be appropriated to the commission by the counties comprising the district. The moneys to be appropriated to the commission shall be raised by the governing bodies of the respective counties by the levy of taxes as authorized by the legislatures of the respective party states.

''(b) The commission shall not incur any indebtedness or obligation of any kind; nor shall the commission pledge the credit of either or any of the counties comprising the district or either of the states party to this compact, except as authorized in article VI. The budget of the district shall be prepared, adopted and published as provided by law for other political subdivisions of the party states. No budget shall be adopted by the commission until it has been submitted to and reviewed by the governing bodies of the counties comprising the district and the governing body of each city represented on the commission.

''(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements.

The receipts and disbursements of the commission shall be audited yearly by a certified or licensed public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

''(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by duly authorized representatives of the compacting states, the counties comprising the district, the cities that appoint a commissioner, and other persons authorized by the commission.

''ARTICLE VIII. ENTRY INTO FORCE

''(a) This compact shall enter into force and become effective and binding upon the states of Kansas and Missouri when it has been entered into law by the legislatures of the respective states.

''(b) Amendments to the compact shall become effective upon enactment by the legislatures of the respective states.

''ARTICLE IX. TERMINATION

''This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon a party state until its legislature shall have enacted a statute repealing the same and providing for the sending of formal written notice of enactment of such statute to the legislature of the other party state. Upon enactment of such a statute by the legislature of either party state, the sending of notice thereof to the other party state, and payment of any obligations which the metropolitan culture district commission may have incurred prior to the effective date of such statute, including, but not limited to, the retirement of any outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district, the agreement of the party states embodied in the compact shall be deemed fully executed, the compact shall be null and void and of no further force or effect, the metropolitan culture district shall be dissolved, and the metropolitan culture district commission shall be abolished.

''ARTICLE X. CONSTRUCTION AND SEVERABILITY

''The provisions of this compact shall be liberally construed and shall be severable. If any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of either of the party states or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of either of the states party thereto, the compact shall thereby be nullified and voided and of no further force or effect.

''(a) The board of county commissioners of any county which has been authorized by a majority of the electors of the county to create or to become a part of the metropolitan culture district and to levy and collect a tax for the purpose of contributing to the financial support of the district shall adopt a resolution imposing a countywide retailers' sales tax and pledging the revenues received therefrom for such purpose. The rate of such tax shall be fixed in an amount of not more than .25%. Any county levying a retailers' sales tax under authority of this section is hereby prohibited from administering or collecting such tax locally, but shall utilize the services of the state department of revenue to administer, enforce and collect such tax. The sales tax shall be administered, enforced and collected in the same manner and by the same procedure as other countywide retailers' sales taxes are levied and collected and shall be in addition to any other sales tax authorized by law. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution authorizing the levy of a countywide retailers' sales tax pursuant to this section, the state director of taxation shall cause such tax to be collected within and outside the boundaries of such county at the same time and in the same manner provided for the collection of the state retailers' sales tax. All moneys collected by the director of taxation under the provisions of this section shall be credited to the metropolitan culture district retailers' sales tax fund which fund is hereby established in the state treasury. Any refund due on any countywide retailers' sales tax collected pursuant to this section shall be paid out of the sales tax refund fund and reimbursed by the director of taxation from retailers' sales tax revenue collected pursuant to this section. All countywide retailers' sales tax revenue collected within any county pursuant to this section shall be remitted at least quarterly by the state treasurer, on instruction from the director of taxation, to the treasurer of such county.

''(b) All revenue received by any county treasurer from a countywide retailers' sales tax imposed pursuant to this section shall be appropriated by the county to the metropolitan culture district commission within 60 days of receipt of the funds by the county for expenditure by the commission pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact. If any such revenue remains upon nullification and voidance of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact, the county treasurer shall deposit such revenue to the credit of the general fund of the county.

''(c) Any countywide retailers' sales tax imposed pursuant to this section shall expire upon the date of actual withdrawal of the county from the metropolitan culture district or at any time the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact becomes null and void and of no further force or effect. If any moneys remain in the metropolitan culture district retailers' sales tax fund upon nullification and voidance of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact, the state treasurer shall transfer such moneys to the county and city retailers' sales tax fund to be apportioned and remitted at the same time and in the same manner as other countywide retailers' sales tax revenues are apportioned and remitted.''.

SEC. 2. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.

The Congress expressly deserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4700, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), I would like to address this particular bill, H.R. 4700.

This bill grants the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to facilitate cultural development in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area.

The compact being considered is uniquely designed to encourage cross-state cultural and intellectual development. Like the original Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture Compact, approved by Congress in 1994, the compact proposed by H.R. 4700 allows voters from both States to jointly support cultural activities benefiting the bistate region.

While nearly identical to the culture compact approved by Congress in 1994, the culture compact proposed by this bill expands the definition of cultural programs to cover sport activities and facilities. It also changes the composition of the culture commission to maintain balanced representation from both States.

Finally, like its predecessor, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that implementation of the compact would have no fiscal impact on the U.S. Treasury, and I will include the letter from the CBO for the RECORD.

Passage of the 1994 Kansas and Missouri Culture Compact has brought cultural and aesthetic renewal to residents of the Kansas City metropolitan region, while obtaining a broad measure of bipartisanship in the member States and in the Congress. With our help, Kansas and Missouri will continue the cultural invigoration of the greater Kansas City area, and I urge support of the bill.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC July 20, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4700, a bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Lanette J. Keith.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen).

Enclosure.

H.R. 4700.—A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact

H.R. 4700 would give Congressional consent to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact entered into by Kansas and Missouri. A similar agreement was approved by the Congress in 1994 but that agreement will end in 2001. Enacting H.R. 4700 would enable certain counties in the two states to continue to apply a local sales tax to fund historical preservation activities within the district. Enacting the resolution would result in no cost to the federal

government. Because enactment of H.R. 4700 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Lanette J. Keith. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY), who has done so much work on this important issue affecting her district, be allowed to control the time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) very much for that gracious introduction. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who so eloquently described this very positive and special bill.

I would also like to take a moment, Madam Speaker, to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS); as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS); and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), for expediting this very important effort for my community.

Last Tuesday, the bill was heard in the subcommittee and marked up; last Wednesday in the full committee and marked up; and here we are on Monday, Madam Speaker, back to the floor for a vote by the full membership on consideration of the renewal of this important bistate compact.

In the 1980s, when I served in the Missouri legislature in the House and chaired the Ways and Means Committee there, I and others of like mind, who realized that the uniqueness of Kansas City, with its State line dividing both a Kansas community and a Missouri community with common interests, might require some creative taxing mechanism in order to restore and to secure the very beautiful landmarks that we have there, both in culture, the arts, and also in our heritage, and yet not any one community could do it alone, so we created this bistate cultural compact that needed the approval by the people of greater Kansas City, which is, of course, home to 1.7 million supporters.

We initially proposed this in the Kansas and Missouri legislatures, I happened to handle it in the Missouri House, and gained the approval of those two bodies in 1987, when we introduced it, and then again as we revised it. In 1994, when we finally agreed to it and passed it and it was signed into law by both governors, I came here as a State legislator to advocate for it before the Committee on the Judiciary and was very pleased for its passage in the House then.

It is being renewed now because it needs to have some changes made to it. We sunset it, quite appropriately then, to make sure it would work successfully, and it has. Now we want to take it back to the community with the changes that the gentleman from Arkansas described in order for the voters to approve its continuance.

The major success story of this effort, this rather unique effort, has been the restoration of our Union Station, a very important structure to both communities, located on the Missouri side. It is second in the Nation in size and history to Grand Central Station. It had fallen into great disrepair and deterioration, was looking for some current use, and this bistate cultural tax raised almost half the money needed to restore the building. It has been turned into a wonderful science center and museum and is a great gathering place for many, many cultural events in the community.

It has been such a great bringing together of people on both sides of the State line, rallying around the importance of maintaining this important structure, that we want to go back now and let the commission discuss future use that might include comprehensive projects to support the arts for school-aged children and renovation or rehabilitation of arts facilities on both sides of the State line. Youth athletic facilities projects are desperately needed and seriously contemplated by the commission. And of course maintenance on existing athletic facilities will be included under new language in the compact.

So I am very, very pleased today to be here in support of this effort, and I would like again to thank the members of the committee for their bipartisan effort in making this a priority and moving so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, I am providing for the RECORD some letters of support from individuals and organizations involved in this back home in Kansas and Missouri.

GREATER KANSAS CITY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: The Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce has been a strong supporter of the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact since it was first proposed more than 10 years ago by a civic task force organized by Kansas City Consensus. From the very beginning, the concept of a multijurisdiction tax for common purposes in a bistate region like Greater Kansas City has had great appeal.

The Chamber was a principal player in the passage of the bistate tax to restore Kansas City's Union Station and establish Science City at the station. The success of that project has naturally led to speculation about other regional needs that might be met through this innovative approach.

Consequently, The Chamber was a leader in the effort to expand the eligible use of bistate tax revenues through legislation in Kansas and Missouri to include sports and sports facilities as well as the cultural arts.

The Chamber continues to be an enthusiastic supporters of the bistate tax concept and urges appropriate action by the Congress to facilitate the further use of this creative multijurisdictional initiative for regional purposes.

Sincerely,

PETER S. LEVI,
President.

KANSAS CITY
AREA DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: I'm writing to let you know the support of the Kansas City Area Development Council (KCADC) for HR 4700 granting congressional approval for the bistate compact that would authorize the creation of the Metropolitan Cultural District in the Kansas City area.

KCADC, from its inception in 1976, has been a bistate organization. As you know, we serve 15 counties in both Kansas and Missouri. We approach business attraction and the growth of the economy from a bistate perspective because our community is truly one community that simply happens to be joined by a state line. Nothing could be more important to us than the approval of this legislation. The furtherance of regional cooperation and funding key cultural assets assuming voter approval is critical to the ongoing development of our community. The fact that the legislation has received support in the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri and would only be enacted upon a vote of the people, provides both evidence of broad support and all necessary safeguards.

We are appreciative of your leadership in this effort and ask that you will do all that is possible to encourage the approval of this legislation initially by the House Judiciary Committee and then by the full House and Senate.

Best regards,

ROBERT J. MARCUSSE,
President and CEO.

MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: This letter is to convey the support of the Mid-America Regional Council for HR 4700 to grant congressional approval for the bistate compact authorizing creation of the Metropolitan Culture District in the Kansas City area.

As the council of governments and metropolitan planning group for Greater Kansas City, MARC has keen interest in seeing the continuance of this important mechanism to allow for voter-approved regional cooperation in funding key cultural assets. MARC has played an active role in supporting this initiative over the years, and we are eager to see this tool continue to serve our regional community. The proposed changes to the bistate compact enjoy broad public support and have already been approved by the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri.

We appreciate your leadership in ensuring continuation of this issue so important to our metropolitan progress.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. WARM,
Executive Director.

OVERLAND PARK
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Overland Park, KS, July 17, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Overland Park Chamber of Commerce and its 1,100 members, I want to thank you for granting a timely hearing on HR 4700.

The Overland Park business community wishes to declare its support for the passage of HR 4700. Its passage will complete a legislative process that provides increased flexibility and expanded options for the Kansas City metropolitan area in future bi-state efforts.

Citizens and businesses in both Kansas and Missouri, with the Union Station bi-state success, have demonstrated an ability to reach consensus and support for important projects. This bill, supported by both state legislatures, enhances that unique relationship.

We appreciate your support in addressing this important community issue.

Sincerely,

MARY BIRCH CCE,
President.

JANUARY 4, 2000.

To: Johnson County Commission.

From: Johnson County Chambers Presidents Council, Linda Leeper, Chairman.

Re: Bi-State Efforts.

As strong supporters of the bi-state initiative to renovate Union Station and construct Science City, the chambers of commerce in Johnson County wish to commend the voters of the four counties, the Bi-State Commission, the Union Station Assistance Corporation, the Union Station Project Council and civic leaders for a job well done. This phenomenal project will serve as an excellent first effort toward future partnerships that identify, pursue and support other bi-state efforts.

At this time, the Johnson County Chambers Presidents Council has discussed future bi-state efforts and would like to convey the following concepts to be considered as developments and ideas proceed.

We believe:

1. The current ⅛ cent bi-state sales tax for Union Station/Science City should sunset (end) as promised to the voters.

2. The bi-state tax should be used to enhance quality-of-life components that are not traditionally funded by government, such as the arts, and to preserve major community institutions.

3. The bi-state tax cannot and should not be seen or used as ''the'' solution for all the problems of the metro-plex.

4. If there is a second bi-state effort, it should include both the arts as was originally intended and consideration of efforts in Kansas. Serious consideration should be given to the renovation or construction of a building in Johnson County for an arts venue.

5. Also, consideration should be given to including sports facilities as a beneficiary of the next bi-state effort. There is no doubt that Kansas City's professional sports teams are a significant economic development component for the entire metropolitan area. The bi-state component, however, similar to Union Station, should be only one part of a larger multi-source funded effort.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
OF GREATER KANSAS CITY,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

U.S. Rep. KAREN MCCARTHY,
E. 9th St., Suite 9350,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR REP. MCCARTHY: The Labor-Management Council of Greater Kansas City urges support from the U.S. Congress for ''Bi-State II'' legislation. We supported passage of the revised bi-state approach in both the Missouri and Kansas legislatures, and we thank you for your support for the successful first bi-state project as well as for this effort.

As an organization comprised of more than 80 businesses, unions, nonprofits and governments from throughout the Kansas City area, the Labor-Management Council focuses on efforts that enhance the entire metropolitan community. Bi-State II will allow us the opportunity to explore and possibly implement public improvement projects that benefit citizens in both states.

The Labor-Management Council requires a unanimous vote of its Board of Directors to take a public issue position. Bi-State II's achievement of such unanimous support from our diverse leadership demonstrates its strong appeal to labor and to management, to Missourians and to Kansas, to Democrats and to Republicans, to urban and to suburban residents.

We are very pleased that Congress is appropriately considering this legislation to help address our community's needs that cross state, county and municipal lines. Passage of Bi-State II by Congress would allow us to continue our work to benefit the entire metropolitan community.

Please feel free to share our position with your colleagues, and to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

BOB JACOBI, Jr.,
Executive Director.

JACKSON COUNTY EXECUTIVE,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: I am writing to express my support for HR 4700, which would grant congressional approval for the bi-state compact authorizing creation of the Metropolitan Culture District in the Kansas City area.

Jackson County is proud of its role in the development and implementation of the successful initiative at Kansas City's Liberty Memorial, and looks forward to the opportunity to extend a bi-state solution into other long term capital needs of the entire Kansas City metropolitan area.

We appreciate your efforts in ensuring the continuation and expansion of this cooperative effort among local governments across our region.

Sincerely,

KATHERYN J. SHIELDS,
County Executive.

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Topeka, KS.

COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE FAX

From: Don Brown, Communications Director.

Governor Graves made the following comments shortly before signing the Bi-State II legislation:

''I am extremely pleased with the success of our first Bi-State project. The Science City at Union Station, quite frankly, would not exist as we know it today without the funding from this arts and culture initiative. I am pleased to be able to sign the Bi-State II legislation into Kansas Law. This is just one step in the process, of course. I'm confident the government leaders and voters in the respective counties in and around Kansas City will make good choices as they explore another phase of this cooperative effort.''

CARNAHAN SIGNS BILL TO EXPAND
METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT

Gov. Mel Carnahan gave final approval today to a new law that expands the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to include sports facilities and events.

Carnahan signed the legislation (Senate Bill 719) at Union Station, which reopened last year after being restored through the efforts of the Culture District—a four-county area encompassing Kansas City.

''Bringing Union Station back to life is a testimony to the tremendous success the Culture District has experienced,'' Carnahan said. ''This legislation will allow the district to build upon that success by including sports facilities and events.''

The new legislation will allow sporting events and sports facilities to qualify as approved projects for the Culture District. This will enable voters in the district to approve funding for sports-related activities in addition to other cultural facilities and events.

The legislation also adds two members to the Culture District Commission, the district's governing body. That provision was necessary due to the consolidation of Kansas City, Kan., and Wyandotte County governments. The additional two members will ensure equal representation from Kansas and Missouri on the commission.

''Many Kansas Citians from both sides of the state line are proud of the accomplishments that have been achieved through the bistate Culture District,'' Carnahan said. ''The work of the district and its commission is proof that great things can be done when the spirit of cooperation is a prominent force.''

[From the Kansas City Star, Nov. 8, 1999]

DONORS PRAISE UNION STATION

(By Brian Burnes)

Union Station's opening week continued Sunday as about 1,200 benefactors who had contributed $1,000 or more to the renovation project gathered for an early look at the landmark.

The reviews were good.

''I think it's wonderful. It's fabulous,'' said Betty Shouse of Kansas City as she stood in the old North Waiting Room, now Festival Plaza.

''I'm in awe of the ceiling,'' said Carson Ross, a Missouri state representative from Blue Springs, referring to the restored and repainted ceiling in the Grand Hall.

Shouse and Ross also offered praise for the bistate cooperation that led to $118 million in taxpayer contributions to the renovation from a one-eight-cent sales tax passed in Jackson, Johnson, Clay and Plate counties in 1996.

''I'm so glad that we were able to have that kind of cooperation among the various parts of Kansas City,'' Shouse said.

''Being, able to bring both states together for this was historic,'' Ross said. ''I tell people from other states about this and they can't believe it.''

As the late afternoon sun poured through the west windows, most visitors could be seen looking up at the ceiling or at the huge clock hanging from it.

''What's fun about this is that each person who comes through feels that they had a piece of the project, so it's exciting for them to see it all come together now,'' said Bill Musgrave, a vice president of the Kansas City Museum, which is developing Science City inside the station.

Renovation officials said Sunday's crowd—much smaller than the crowd of approximately 3,700 who jammed in Friday night—had its virtues.

''Friday night was elbow to elbow,'' said John Patrick Burnett, a member of the project's Bistate Commission, which oversaw the spending of taxpayer money. ''But this was very nice today, and you could actually see some of the exhibits of Science City.''

Within Science City, benefactors mingled with some of the approximately 25 ''interactors,'' or costumed performers who will visit with Science City guests in front of some of the approximately 50 ''environments.''

Interspersed with the interactors were construction workers, some of whom continued working on the Festival Plaza fountain as the party went on around them. The stations opening week continues Tuesday with a preview for volunteers scheduled for 5 to 9 pm.

The grand opening of Science City at Union Station is scheduled for 10 a.m. Wednesday on the station's south plaza.

[From Preservation, November/December 1999]

HOPE RIDES ON THE $250 MILLION MAKEOVER OF KANSAS CITY'S UNION STATION

(By Steve Paul)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Kansas citizens have been waiting decades for life to return to the 1914 Union Station, once among the nation's busiest monuments to rail travel. Now the wait is over. Science City, a so-called edutainment complex appended to the newly restored station, has its grand opening on Nov. 10.

A private-public partnership partly funded by taxpayers in two states spurred the ambitious project with a price tag of $250 million, so there's an extraordinary amount of breath holding. Can the enormous building again become the city's premier gathering place? If revelers return to the station's cavernous spaces this New Year's Eve, the turn of the millennium may be less meaningful than the emotional reconnection to a cherished monument the public didn't know what to do with.

Preservation purists are hoping Science City's idiosyncrasies won't undermine the reception given to restoration of the decayed station itself, second in size only to Grand Central Terminal in Manhattan. Still, the ultimate test of success will be whether tourist dollars can underwrite local pride and any sense that such gathering place is needed.

Andy Scott, executive director of the Union Station Assistance Corp., the building's private, nonprofit owner since 1994, hopes the restoration will redefine downtown. Ever optimistic, Scott is already envisioning more redevelopment. A new pedestrian bridge, designed by Siah Armajani, has been proposed to link the station with the Crossroads district across the rail yards to the north. A lively renaissance of art galleries, restaurants, and residential lofts is under way in that neighborhood of converted warehouses and industrial buildings.

Scott's optimism also stems from the statute of the station itself, designed by Chicago architect Jarvis Hunt in a restrained Beaux-Arts style with well-proportioned columns, windows, and entablature. With all the personal interaction that took place within, Scott says, Union Station means a lot to people in the metropolitan area of 1.7 million. ''This building,'' he says, ''was built with such vision and care and love of beauty and architecture that it can inspire people.''

Union Station was nearly comatose long before it closed more than a decade ago. In the '80s it suffered a kick in the architectural groin when an office building was crammed into a corner of its T-shaped plan.

That building remains, but the reflections in its mirror-glass reds and blues outlined by cream trim and gold-hued plaster foliage. It also suspends a trio of respected 3,000-pound chandeliers from ornate rosettes.

Science City, a project of the Kansas City Museum, will occupy a new glass-topped annex abutting the station's former North Waiting Room. Responding to focus groups who said they wanted to have fun, the museum made something akin to an amusement park involving science as adventure.

''It's not a museum, it's not a science center, it's not a themes park, it's not theater,'' says Science City President David A. Ucko. ''The phrase I've been using is 'recreational learning.'''

The station's North Waiting Room, more than 100 yards long, serves as the entry to the multilevel maze of Science City. Visitors will be deposited into a series of environments—a hospital, a crime scene, a cave—with actors conducting learning experiences.

There will be a historical streetscape providing a memory lane of pop culture: old televisions showing period programs in an appliance-store window, for instance. A live stage will present science and historical shows. A large-screen Iwerks theater is being installed for science and nature films in 2–D and 3–D formats. And a planetarium will put a laser-show spin on sky gazing lessons.

Nighttime activities are crucial to the return of a constant flow of people—and their dollars—to the station. So the theaters will do double duty, showing Science City films by day and general-interest, date-inducing movies by night. The North Waiting Room, available for special events, can accommodate as many as 1,200 diners. Several restaurants are opening in and off the cavernous Grand Hall.

For the multitudes who passed through there, Union Station is something like a memory bank. Emotional departures and returns were plentiful for several generations before passenger-train traffic and the station itself began to began to decline after World War II. ''In many ways,'' says Dave Boutras of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection in Kansas City, ''it is about the only public place that represents the metro area.''

The feeling of a shared history—and the vision of a shared future—helped persuade taxpayers in Johnson County, Kan., an affluent Kansas City suburb, to contribute to the project through a one-eighth-cent bistate sales tax. They joined voters in the three Missouri countries through which Kansas City sprawls to pony up $118 million in tax money. The rest of the construction funding came from more than $30 million in federal grants and $100 million in private donations.

Significant participation ($20 million) came from Hallmark Cards, Inc., and the Hall Family Foundation. Hallmark's headquarters and Crown Center, a complex with two hotels, restaurants, a shopping mall, and an updated bus waiting area, will be linked to the station by an elevated, glass-enclosed walkway.

An important aspect of the redevelopment is Union Station's revival as a transportation center. Local buses, tourist trolleys, and planned commuter-rail line from Johnson County will stop there, as will a light-rail line in Kansas City, if it ever gets built. Amtrak service may return to the building after its long exile on the bottom level of an underground parking garage.

Long a prominent symbol of inner-city deterioration and dis-investment as it sat rotting, Union Station is ready to be embraced with the pride and excitement it was born to 85 years ago.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1999]

IN KANSAS CITY, FEW TRAINS, BUT NEW LIFE IN THE STATION

(By Shirley Christian)

KANSAS CITY, MO, Nov. 14—It required new laws in two states, sales-tax elections in five counties and an act of Congress, as well as a major corporate giving campaign, but Kansas City's monumental Union Station has finally been restored to the grandeur it once enjoyed as a centerpiece of the nation's passenger rail network.

Even as construction crews raced to finish the $250 million restoration and expansion of the station, the completed portions opened to the public last week after a spate of events toasting large donors and volunteers.

Very few passenger trains pass through Kansas City now, so the station's restored Grand Hall, with its 95-foot ceiling and three 3,000-pound chandeliers, is to serve as a public space, surrounded by new restaurants, shops and offices. The station, second in size in this country only to Grand Central Terminal in Manhattan, is envisioned as a vast indoor plaza, a gathering place intended to help draw people back to the center of the city.

The station opened in 1914 with nearly one million square feet of space. It has been expanded in this new incarnation with a 300,000-square-foot wing on the west side to house Science City, described by its creators as a place of ''recreational learning.'' Science City is projected to draw a million paying visitors a year.

''We are creating an educational attraction for all ages,'' said David A. Ucko, president of Science City and the Kansas City Museum, which will manage it. ''There will a high degree of emotional engagement, and everything will be contextual, nothing abstract. There will be a lot of humor. This won't be a deadly serious place.''

Those who planned, argued and campaigned for years to put together the complicated financing package for Union Station are so pleased with the results that even before the reopening they were talking of returning to the voters and asking them to extend the culture sales tax, which made the restoration possible. The idea would be to use the tax to finance a wider array of cultural offerings. Supporters said the rebirth of the station, whose architectural features are similar to those of Grand Central and Union Station in Washington, has brought a new sense of metropolitan spirit on both sides of the Missouri-Kansas line, a border across which some of the vilest actions of the Civil War occurred.

Civil leaders are daring to dream of what else might be financed by extending the eighth-of-a-cent culture tax beyond 2002, when the station restoration will be paid off. Possibilities include creation of a publicly financed arts endowment, which could benefit museums like the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, performance groups like the Lyric Opera and the Kansas City Symphony, and smaller organizations.

Other noncultural possibilities include updating the stadiums in which the football Chiefs and baseball Royals play and improving the very limited public transportation system, which serves one of the most sprawled metropolitan areas in the country.

The new Arts Council of Metropolitan Kansas City was formed partly to look at how a culture tax or other public money might be sought for the arts.

''Kansas City is in the top quartile of cities for private funding of the arts,'' said Jan Kreamer, president of the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation and an organizer of the arts council. ''But we are near the bottom of public funding.''

Two regional neighbors, Denver and St. Louis, have adopted taxes for cultural purposes, she said. But she added that no specific proposals would be formulated here until public surveys on the issue are completed. Joan Israelite, president of the Arts Council, said its creation was part of a great expansion of arts and cultural activity. ''We're on the verge of a cultural renaissance,'' she said.

The financing of the area's cultural and other needs has grown increasingly complicated as development has spread into the five counties in Kansas and Missouri that make up the metropolitan region, and into a second tier of surrounding counties in both states as well. More than 100 municipal and other governmental entities are involved, and the principal city, Kansas City, Mo., has become a smaller piece of the whole even though its population is growing slightly.

Unlike most other metropolitan areas that reach across state lines, this region's population of 1.7 million is fairly evenly divided between the two states, as are business and industry, and people here seem to view the state line as the de facto heart of the city. Booming Johnson County, Kan., with 20-some suburban cities, rivals Kansas City proper in size and economic clout, Kansas City, Kan., much smaller and poorer than Kansas City, Mo., or Johnson County, maintains a strong industrial base.

A century and a half ago civic leaders of the two Kansas Cities laid out their principal arteries within walking distance of the other state; Union Station was built just blocks east of the state line.

''The fact is that we function as an economic city-state,'' said Jack Holland, an investment banker who began working on the bistate financing concept 15 years ago.

He was part of a group called Kansas City Consensus, which formed in the early 1980's to look at how Kansas City could continue to pay for cultural and recreational offerings while much of the core city's economic power was being lost to the suburbs. From that group the idea of the bistate tax emerged in 1985.

The group recommended a sales tax instead of a property tax because a sales tax could be applied uniformly throughout the metropolitan area. By contrast, assessed valuation for a similar piece of property might vary from country to county and state to state.

Supporters of the bistate tax said they found many examples around the country of culture taxes and of metropolitan area taxes that crossed county lines, but no examples of a tax that crossed a state line.

After passage of the enabling legislation in Kansas and Missouri in 1993, representatives from each state decided what projects to propose to voters. Although arts and other culture groups had been the driving force behind passage of the legislation, they had trouble agreeing on a package of programs and institutions to support.

In the end everybody could agree only on raising money to restore Union Station. Its beauty, even in its abandoned and unmaintained state, and the emotional attachment felt by people across the area made the station ''the perfect candidate for election,'' said Jack Craft, a lawyer who led the culture-tax campaign in Missouri. ''It's handsome, and it doesn't talk.''

Next, advocates of the tax had to deal with the almost legendary distrust that Kansans have of the politicians in Kansas City, Mo. ''So a lot of safeguards were built into the Union Station operating agreement,'' said State Rose, a suburban newspaper publisher who ran the culture-tax campaign in Kansas.

A separate legal entity was created to own and operate the station, and an agreement was drawn up that, if the restoration project should fail at some point, ownership of Union Station would pass not to the city of Kansas City, Mo., but to he community foundation headed by headed by Ms. Kreamer. Still nervous about the outcome of the voting, the advocates of the tax mounted what Mr. Craft said was the most expensive political campaign ever conducted in the Kansas City region, costing slightly more than $1 million. Some advertising and public relations concerns donated services.

On Nov. 5, 1996, the culture tax went before the voters in the five counties. It passed with more than 60 percent of the vote in four, losing only in Wyandotte County, site of Kansas City. Kan., the poorest county in the metropolitan area.

The tax is raising $118 million of the cost of restoring and expanding the station. An additional $100 million was raised from private contributors; the rest is coming from federal money.

Forty million dollars of the estimated $250 million price tag was set aside as an endowment whose income will pay part of the operating costs for Science City and Union Station. The rest of the $18 million operating budget is to come from paying visitors to Science City and from leasing the office and commercial space.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4700, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact. This bipartisan legislation would allow the metropolitan area of Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County to continue the progress of successful arts and cultural initiatives.

Extending the present compact, which is set to expire in 2001, would include sports facilities in the cultural definition. It would also correct the inequity created by the consolidation of the governments of the City of Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County, Kansas which gave Missouri and advantage of two votes over Kansas. Finally, the extension would give states the authority to continue local revenue stream of a .125% sales tax used to support cultural activities in the bi-state region.

I commend Representative MCCARTHY from Missouri for her hard work and dedication to moving this legislation through the legislative process. This an excellent example of a bi-state, private-public, local-federal partnership which works well. The continuation of the compact will allow the metropolitan area to further this productive alignment for successful arts and cultural initiatives in the bi-state region and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4700 grants the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to facilitate cultural development in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. The Compact being considered is uniquely designed to encourage cross-state cultural and intellectual development. Like the original Kansas-Missouri Metropolitan Culture Compact approved by Congress in 1994, the Compact proposed by H.R. 4700 allows voters from both states to jointly support cultural activities benefiting the bistate region.

While nearly identical to the Culture Compact approved by Congress in 1994, the Culture Compact proposed by H.R. 4700 expands the definition of cultural programs to cover sport activities and facilities. It also changes the composition of the Culture Commission to maintain balanced representation from both states. Finally, like its predecessor, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that implementation of the Compact would have no fiscal impact on the U.S. Treasury.

Passage of the 1994 Kansas and Missouri Culture Compact has brought cultural and aesthetic renewal to residents of the Kansas City metropolitan region while obtaining a broad measure of bipartisanship in the member states and in the Congress. With our help, Kansas and Missouri will continue the cultural invigoration of the greater Kansas City area and I urge your support of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise to share my support for H.R. 4700, which would grant the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact. I like to start by thanking my friend and colleague, Congresswoman KAREN MCCARTHY, for her leadership on this issue. Her tireless work for the Fifth District of Missouri and the people of the Kansas City metropolitan area should be commended.

Over the past four years, we have enjoyed the successes of the original bi-state compact that was passed by Congress in 1994, that continues to receive tremendous support from individuals and organizations on both sides of the state line. This agreement is essential to a unique city with a state line running through the middle of town. Many residents work on one side of state line and reside on the other. The economy and culture of the region are vitally important to all residents of the Kansas City metropolitan area.

This compact made possible the restoration of Union Station and the completion of Science City, now one of the Kansas City metropolitan area's most important cultural and education facilities. Union Station is a remarkable example of what can be accomplished when federal, state, and local governments work with private and public contributors to improve our communities.

As the existing compact is scheduled to conclude at the end of 2001, it is our responsibility to see to it that a new compact is approved to continue this successful venture. Furthermore, it is important to take this opportunity to correct the advantage of two votes that Missouri currently holds on the Bi-State Board, due to the consolidation of the governments of the Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County, Kansas, into the new Unified Government. This inequity should be resolved to preserve the balance and harmony of the Compact.

As we move into the twenty-first century, it is even more important to take steps to preserve our common history and strengthen our great community. The Bi-State Compact will enable us to take on cultural initiatives, improve education, develop transportation proposals, and improve the lives of those in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

I support this legislation, which I have cosponsored, because I believe the residents of the metropolitan area should be able to decide for themselves if they want to participate in this project. I can think of no better way to decide the issue than to give the authority directly to voters on both sides of the state line.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4700, which gives Congressional approval to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact.

One of the hallmarks of this Republican Congress has been its commitment to empowering state and local governments to address local and regional challenges. This legislation is a great example of that commitment. H.R. 4700 imposes no federal mandates on the states of Kansas and Missouri, or on the local governments which have endorsed the compact. It does not call for the use of federal dollars. It does not require that the Compact be extended into the future. Instead, it simply gives the necessary Congressional approval to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact.

The Compact is a unique effort to provide a secure source of local funding for metropolitan cooperation across state lines to restore historic structures and cultural facilities. Since it was established a few years ago, local leaders have worked through the Compact to restore Kansas City's Union State, one of the Midwest's important historic landmarks. It has also led to the addition of the Kansas City Museum's Science City Project. When the Compact was initially created in 1994, sanctioning legislation sped through both the House and Senate by voice votes in just a few months.

As other advocates of H.R. 4700 have noted, the breadth of support for the Compact is overwhelming. It is supported by the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri, the Governors of both states, and by both Republican and Democratic elected officials. I commend the gentlelady from Kansas City for bringing this measure forward, and I encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized to control the time of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4700.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO RED RIVER BOUNDARY COMPACT

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent of Congress is given to the Red River Compact entered into between the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the new boundary established by the compact.

(b) NEW COMPACT.—The compact referred to in subsection (a) sets the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River (except for the Texoma area where the boundary is established pursuant to procedures provided for in the compact) and is the compact—

(1) agreed to by the State of Texas in House Bill 1355 approved by the Governor of Texas on May 24, 1999; and

(2) agreed to by the State of Oklahoma in Senate Bill 175 approved by the Governor of Oklahoma on June 4, 1999.

(c) COMPACT.—The Acts referred to in subsection (b) are recognized by Congress as an interstate compact pursuant to section 10 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—The compact shall not in any manner alter—

(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in interest;

(2) any tribal trust lands;

(3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation;

(4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and

(5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on August 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As everyone knows by now, the Constitution requires that when any one State or more than one State wishes to enter into an agreement with one or another State, that agreement is subject to the consent of the Congress. That is why our committee, charged with the responsibility of overseeing those kinds of agreements, brings to the floor, just as we have now, this pending agreement, already reached between the States of Texas and Oklahoma with respect to the boundary line, that momentous boundary line that exists between the two States, namely the Red River.

It appears that over the years the Red River changes its contours from time to time and causes difficulty for everyone concerned in determining the actual dividing line between those two great States in the Southwest. Such continued argument about the boundary has resulted in a final resolution of it. Yet just as the final resolution was reached, it was also determined that the Indian tribes that abound in that area were themselves hurt, or they felt that they would be hurt by the final agreement. They determined that some of their interests, land interests and other, would be harmed if they were not consulted or made a part of the agreement, so that their concerns could be addressed.

Voila, then, we have this new compact before us which takes into account all the concerns that the Indian tribes have uttered over the years. And it was as a result of the dispatch by our committee of our chief counsel, Ray Smietanka, and minority counsel, Mr. Lachmann, to that area that lay the groundwork for the final resolution of this problem.

□ 1530

But we are glad to report that here today we are ready to have the House vote on a complete finalization of the boundary line that the Red River constitutes.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter and cost estimate:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.J. Res. 72, granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(for Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, JULY 20, 2000

H.J. RES. 72—GRANTING THE CONSENT OF THE CONGRESS TO THE RED RIVER BOUNDARY COMPACT, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON JULY 29, 2000

H.J. Res. 72 would give Congressional consent to the Red River Compact entered into by the states of Texas and Oklahoma concerning the new boundary between these states that would be established by the compact. Enacting the resolution would result in no cost to the federal government. Because enactment of H.J. Res. 72 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The resolution contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) whose district is affected by this compact, be allowed to control the time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to first thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, as well as the committee staff, for working with all of the parties interested in this legislation so that we can bring a fair and well-crafted bill to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, House Joint Resolution 72 grants a consent of Congress to the River Boundary Compact entered into between the States of Oklahoma and Texas. This compact establishes a new practical boundary between the two States and ends over 200 years of jurisdictional uncertainty. The State legislatures of both Texas and Oklahoma have approved the compact with overwhelming support.

Madam Speaker, the Red River is 1,290 miles long. For about half of this distance, it serves as the Texas-Oklahoma border. To the great frustration of many of those trying to use the river as a jurisdictional marker, mature rivers like those of the American Midwest tend to meander a great deal.

The natural tendency of a river flowing across flat country is to meander and flow loose as it erodes the outer side of a bend and deposits sediment on the inner side. It is clear that several of the loops of the Red River have changed in this way.

As the Speaker undoubtedly knows, the State of Texas was an independent nation from the years 1836 to 1845. In 1841, engineers surveyed the border along the Red River between the Republic of Texas and the United States. The survey set the boundary between the two countries on the southern bank of the river. This definition was later refined by the Supreme Court of the United States as the gradient boundary line on the south bank.

The survey was carefully done, and the results of the survey as recorded in the engineers' report and monuments placed along the border were accepted by both governments as the true and legal boundary.

Unfortunately, however, the river paid no attention to the survey; and in the years since 1841, the Red River has left that border high and dry. As a result, the artificial boundary line long the Red River has caused general confusion in our States for many decades.

The States of Texas and Oklahoma recognize that there are actual and potential disputes, controversies, and criminal and civil litigation problems arising out of the location of the boundary line between these two States along the Red River. In particular, an inability to identify the boundary at a point in time is a significant problem for law enforcement personnel, taxing authorities, and citizens on both sides of the river.

It is in the interest of the party States to establish the boundary between the States through the use of a readily identifiable and natural landmark. This identifiable line is established in the Red River Boundary Compact. The Compact sets the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River, except for the Texoma area where the boundary is established pursuant to procedures provided for in the compact approved by both States.

The vegetation line, which includes trees, shrubs and grasses, is easily recognizable. More importantly, the use of the vegetation line as the boundary marker also maintains historical significance. Surveyors of the General Land Office and Bureau of Land Management have confirmed that the vegetation line is substantially the same as the gradient boundary line, with the important distinction of being identifiable without a survey.

Like the Red River itself, this compact is the culmination of years of work. It is not easy to settle a jurisdiction battle that dates back to the Louisiana Purchase.

The U.S. Supreme Court has tried twice to settle this dispute, which at one point brought the governor of Oklahoma to the border in a tank. However, true to the slogan ''One Riot, One Ranger,'' the good governor of Oklahoma and his tank was held off by a lone Texas Ranger on his horse.

Madam Speaker, this is good legislation. A great deal of effort went into ensuring that the interest of all parties along the Red River are protected in the compact.

It is important to note that the terms of the Red River Boundary Compact will not affect private property ownership or boundaries. The compact is strictly political in nature and will in no way alter the property or the claims of individuals or federally recognized Indian tribes.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity before the House to recognize the tireless efforts of the chairman of the Red River Boundary Commission of the State of Texas, Mr. William Abney, from Marshall, Texas, a well-respected East Texas attorney, as well as the other members of both the Texas and Oklahoma commissions.

I would also like to offer special thanks to my colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) who is here today for his work and for the work of his staff. I think both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and I recognize that the true work of the House is done by the staff.

I urge Congress to pass House Joint Resolution 72.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, this resolution deals with a special function entrusted to Congress under article I, section 10 of the Constitution.

I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member, for the serious, thoughtful way that they have met this responsibility and for their patience and persistence in making sure that we get every detail of this compact just right.

I also want to thank their staffs, especially Ray Smietanka and David Lachmann, for their work which brought this matter to a successful conclusion and, of course, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) and the other cosponsors of this bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), all of whom represent the border between Texas and Oklahoma.

Finally, I want to thank Trey Bahm of my staff for his work in making sure that we get it right.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) said, Madam Speaker, this dispute goes back 200 years to the Louisiana Purchase. The boundary line between the Louisiana territory and Spain was not well defined at that time. But a treaty with Spain concluded in 1819 by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams helped to define the boundary somewhat more clearly. That boundary was reaffirmed by the U.S. and Mexico and the U.S. and the Republic of Texas.

Later the Supreme Court found that the proper boundary was the gradient boundary along the south bank of the Red River. The problem is that changes periodically, and so it is a difficult thing to measure. They have to have a survey crew go out there to decide where the boundary is every time the river changes. Obviously, that has not worked very well.

Over the years there have been disputes of various kinds. The incident that my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) referred to in the 1930s was one in which Oklahoma failed to follow a court ruling to close the border. One of the Rangers that was sent to deal with the Oklahoma National Guard and the tanks that they brought happened to be my wife's grandfather. And there was a picture of him in Life Magazine meeting the tank, proving that one tank and one Ranger was a pretty equal match.

More recently we have not had that kind of open warfare, but we have had difficulties in law enforcement taxation.

So having a clearly identifiable border, which this resolution sets out, which has been passed by both the State legislatures of Oklahoma and Texas I think makes sense. We guarantee private property rights. We guarantee the rights of the Indian tribes, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) pointed out.

So this, I think at long last, after 200 years, brings to conclusion the disputes and the difficulties raised by this border. I hope that it will gain the unanimous approval of my colleagues.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB B. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob B. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Members in the Chamber and the staff and those in the gallery may wish to rise for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, we had mentioned the fact that the concerns of the Indian tribes in the area were a highlight of the agreement that was finally reached. As a matter of fact, we approved an amendment in full committee, which is now part of the bill, which takes into account those concerns.

Here we have a resolution issued by the Kiowa, Comanche & Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee, which, in effect, approves and supports the amendment, the language that is now in the bill that expresses our concern about the Indian tribe concerns. And it has been duly certified and rendered to our committee. I include for the RECORD that resolution:

KIOWA, COMANCHE AND APACHE INTERTRIBAL LAND USE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION NO. 00–10

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma are federally recognized Tribes with approved constitutions; and

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) is the duly authorized and delegated official body given the responsibility and authority by the three tribes to act on their behalf with respect to the care, maintenance and development of commonly owned tribal properties and resources; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) to accept the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas as follows:

(d) CONSTRUCTION—The compact shall not in any manner alter—(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest; (2) any tribal trust lands; (3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation; (4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and (5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) hereby approve and support the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing KCAILUC Resolution No. 00–10 was duly adopted at a Regular Monthly Meeting of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee held at the KCA Administration Office on July 12, 2000, by a vote of 6 For 1 Against 0 Abstain. A quorum being present and at least two representatives from each tribe concurring in the vote.

BILLY EVANS HORSE,
Chairman.
MELVIN KERCHEE, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.J. Res. 72, a Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Red River Boundary compact. This bipartisan legislation will re-enforce the eroding Red River south bank and establish a new boundary between the states of Texas and Oklahoma. The new boundary is a vegetation line that is not as susceptible to the forces of nature and is substantially the same as the gradient line used to originally determine the states' boundaries.

Initially, three tribal nations, the Kiowa, the Comanche, and the Apaches expressed concerns regarding this legislation's effect on the status of land from which the tribes derive oil and gas royalties. To remedy that issue, language, approved by officials from Texas, Oklahoma, the Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was put into the legislation confirming that neither the rights of the Indian nations nor the boundaries of the Indians lands will be altered by the compact.

I commend my colleagues for working together in a bipartisan manner to resolve this important issue and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 72, the Red River Boundary Compact, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Today, with Congressional consent the border dispute between Oklahoma and Texas that has existed for more than 100 years will come to an end.

The official boundary is currently the south bank of the Red River. However, the Red River constantly runs dry, which makes determining the south bank difficult. There was an obvious need for a new, more definitive way to determine the border.

In 1996, Oklahoma and Texas agreed upon creating a Red River Boundary Commission to solve this border dispute. In the last year, this commission released their findings and both Oklahoma and Texas state governments have agreed on this compromise. This agreement would clarify and affix the boundary between Oklahoma and Texas as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River. This agreement would mean that the Red River would be part of the State of Oklahoma, where it belongs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We need to put a stamp on this agreement which will end the Red River War, and I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 72.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, July 20, 2000:

H.R. 1791, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for harming animals used in Federal law enforcement;

H.R. 4249, to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in northern Europe.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NATIONAL MOTTO FOR GOVERNMENT OF A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 548) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the national motto for the government of a religious people, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the national motto of the United States is ''In God we trust'';

Whereas the national motto was adopted in 1956 and is codified in the laws of the United States at section 302 of title 36, United States Code;

Whereas the national motto is a reference to the Nation's ''religious heritage'' (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668, 676 (1984));

Whereas the national motto recognizes the religious beliefs and practices of the American people as an aspect of our national history and culture;

Whereas nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration;

Whereas the national motto is deeply interwoven into the fabric of our civil polity;

Whereas the national motto recognizes the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded ''under God'';

Whereas the content of the national motto is as old as the Republic itself and has always been as integral a part of the first

amendment as the very words of that charter of religious liberty;

Whereas the display and teaching of the national motto to public school children has a valid secular purpose, such secular purpose being to foster patriotism, symbolize the historical role of religion in our society, express confidence in the future, inculcate hope, and instruct in humility;

Whereas there is a long tradition of government acknowledgment of religion in mottoes, oaths, and anthems;

Whereas the national motto serves ''the legitimate secular purposes of solemnizing public occasions, expressing confidence in the future, and encouraging the recognition of what is worthy of appreciation in society'' (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. at 693 (O'Connor, J., concurring));

Whereas the national motto reflects the sentiment that ''[w]e are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being'' (*Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313 (1952));

Whereas President George Washington, in his Farewell Address, stated, ''[o]f all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports,'' and ''[w]hatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle,'' and ''let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle'';

Whereas President John Adams wrote that ''it is religion and morality alone which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand'';

Whereas the role of religion in public life is an important one which deserves the public's attention;

Whereas the signers of the Declaration of Independence appealed to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of their intentions, and avowed a firm reliance of the protection of Divine Providence;

Whereas President George Washington, in his First Inaugural Address, said that ''it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes'';

Whereas the First Congress urged President George Washington to proclaim ''a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many single favours of Almighty God'';

Whereas the First Congress reenacted the Northwest Ordinance, which stated that ''[r]eligion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged'';

Whereas the Declaration of Independence demonstrates this Nation was founded on transcendent values which flow from a belief in a Supreme Being;

Whereas the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted in Him, is clearly evidenced in their writings, from the Mayflower Compact to the Constitution itself;

Whereas religion has been closely identified with the history and Government of the United States;

Whereas our national life reflects a religious people who earnestly pray that the Supreme Lawgiver guide them in every measure which may be worthy of His blessing; and

Whereas the national motto is prominently engraved in the wall above the Speaker's dais in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, appears over the entrance to the Chamber of the Senate, and is depicted on all United States coins and currency: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives encourages the display of the national motto of the United States in public buildings throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 548.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to review favorably and pass favorably H. Res. 548. This is a resolution that expresses the sense of Congress that the national motto ''In God We Trust'' should be posted and made public in all public buildings across the country.

This is an important resolution, one which is inspired for me by Members of the Colorado State Board of Education, who just a few weeks ago adopted a State resolution encouraging the public display of the national motto ''In God We Trust'' in public schools throughout the State of Colorado.

The State Board of Education in my State recognized the following, that during the Civil War, in response to a public desire for recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins, President Abraham Lincoln signed in law on April 22, 1864, a law which introduced the motto ''In God We Trust'' to our national coinage.

It was on July 30, 1956, that President Dwight Eisenhower signed a law stating that the national motto of the United States is hereby declared to be ''In God We Trust.'' The Federal courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of the national motto and its uses.

It is in the public interest that the State of Colorado's Board of Education affirmed to uphold, affirm and celebrate the national heritage and the traditions and values which have been the foundation and the sustenance of our Nation as well as the elements vital to its future preservation.

Our national motto is one of which we are all proud, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is a motto that we will find posted in a number of sites right here in the United States Capitol Building.

Across from the Capitol above the doors of the opposite body we will find the motto ''In God We Trust'' emblazoned above the doors there. And here in this Chamber just a few feet above where the Speaker stands, we find those encouraging words in bronze and marble, which are front and center as Members of this body stand where I am and where my colleagues are on the House floor to make various presentations of all sorts every day that the United States Congress is in session.

This motto is one that in times of peril and in times of greatness Americans frequently resort to, both as a statement of thanks and also as a statement of reassurance that goes back to our early days, that goes back to our early days which our founders composed and to the Declaration of Independence, observing that all rights and liberties that Americans enjoy, those of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and other rights, are not secured by government, they are not secured by a constitution, they are not secured by a king, not given by some government authority or power of any kind.

No, in the United States, according to our Declaration, all rights that are enjoyed by the American citizens are given to us by the Almighty himself.

It was to that proposition that our Founders appealed for the rectitude of their intentions in securing that declaration and launching a great and mighty Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been troubled for too long a period of time with a certain amount of moral destruction and decay in our country, which results in violence from Americans against Americans, among children, among minorities, among all people who are wishing to thrive and be free and be safe and secure throughout the country.

As we struggle here in this Congress with all kinds of solutions, whether they are to try to curb violence or try to promote responsible behavior or to set the appropriate laws in place to help make our Nation more safe and secure, it is fitting that we look to our national motto, which is the most fundamental statement, in my estimation, of where the answer lies. And so, this motto is one that all Americans embrace, one that we enjoy and celebrate routinely.

But, on this day, I hope that the House will join me and the others that have cosponsored this bipartisan legislation in passing this resolution, which suggests that the motto should be prominently displayed in public buildings throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, which encourages States and localities to promote ''In God We Trust'' I guess in public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, we have had no hearings on this resolution. In fact, the final version of the resolution that I received has a date stamp on it, July 24, 5:11 p.m., which was just a few minutes ago the final version that we are considering now was produced. It was not even introduced until 2 weeks ago, and now here we are considering it.

This is a complicated issue when we start talking about religious freedoms. And my colleagues can notice by some of the recent Supreme Court cases, many of them 5–4, some going one way and then in the next case going the other way. We have had recent Supreme Court decisions on religious freedom, just the Texas case where they threw out the school prayer on football games on a 6–3 vote. This is a complicated issue. There are no easy answers to this. And here we are at a very short notice trying to consider this.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very sensitive to this because I come from Virginia. Virginia led the Nation in religious freedom. The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was the basis for the First Amendment Bill of Rights. And so, I do not take this casually.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we assumed the role of the United States Supreme Court when we declared that the Ohio statute, the Ohio motto which had religious implications, was constitutional. That was an interesting exercise in light of Marbury v. Madison, a case decided by the Supreme Court a couple of centuries ago which stated that it was the Supreme Court's responsibility to declare statutes constitutional or not constitutional, not Congress's.

But, in any case, with the emergency, no hearings, here we are on the floor. We are not trying to improve Medicare with prescription drugs. We are not trying to preserve Social Security. We are not doing anything about HMO reform or juvenile crime or background checks for firearm purchases. We are here with this emergency legislation, without any hearings here on the floor, no markup in committee so that these complicated Supreme Court decisions can be analyzed so that we will know what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not unusual for this Congress. We have shown a lot of disrespect for the Constitution. As a matter of fact, in the last 2 years or so, we have tried to amend the Constitution no less than nine separate times.

We had a prayer amendment that was given consideration, campaign finance, the flag amendment, balanced budget amendment, tax limitation amendment, term limits, electoral college, victims' rights. We even had a hearing on an amendment to make it easier to amend the Constitution.

The Constitution is a foundation of American law that we all have to live under. But, of course, some people seem so privileged that they do not have to live under the same laws and same Constitution as everybody else.

In fact, just this session, when we had a case where a bank lost a case filed by the Department of Labor, instead of being subjected to the law like everybody else, the Committee on Education and Workforce reported a bill to retroactively change the law to help that bank out.

A few years ago, we settled a complex child custody case with language found in a transportation appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary recently reported a bill to retroactively change the law so asbestos manufacturers will not have to pay the bills run up by victims of asbestos related lung disease.

Here we are, no hearing, 2 weeks after the introduction of the bill, pretending to give consideration to this complex issue involving our fundamental religious liberties.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that instead of this kind of drive-by consideration that we would show more respect for our Constitution and our religious liberties by voting no on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as to the complexity of this legislation, I would differ with the description of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that this is a complex matter. In fact, it is nothing close to that, unless we try to read items such as we just heard about asbestos and banking and Medicare and drug abuse and these kinds of things into that resolution.

None of these items appear here. This is strictly on the motto that we read in front of us here on the House floor and whether it is suitable for the Congress to suggest that it be displayed in public buildings around the country.

I think as far as whether individuals need hearings to understand the importance of whether ''In God We Trust'' is still a useful motto for the country, I would suggest that most Members probably have a firm opinion about that at the moment. But I will concede that the date that we find on the bottom of the bill suggests it might have been introduced just a few minutes ago.

Actually, the bill has been introduced a few weeks now. This version that is in front of us now and that was moved by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) is a corrected version. There were some errors in the legal citations of the Supreme Court references, as well as a couple erroneous dates that were mentioned here. So the version in front of us has no substantive difference from the version which has been before the House now for more than a couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) yielding me the time to speak on the bill and on behalf of the bill.

It is not many times I get up here and talk on the opposite side of my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). But in this I believe.

''In God We Trust'' is our motto. We can see it above the Speaker's head right here. And it should be engraved into our national conscience. The values we teach at home and church are universal and should not be left outside the schoolhouse door or outside of where we work and play every day.

I am not afraid to say ''In God We Trust'' whenever and wherever I want. All Americans should have that right. However, I have long been concerned about the decline of moral values and freedoms in our society.

Recently I introduced H. Res. 551, which encourages ''In God We Trust'' to be posted prominently in all public and government buildings, just like it is in my own office, right next to the Ten Commandments.

I wrote H. Res. 551 with the direct assistance of Reverend Donald Wildman of the American Family Association. It is a bipartisan measure with 23 cosponsors on the bill. However, today we have H. Res. 548, the bill on the floor today.

This is an issue too important to let partisan politics get in the way, so I have added my name as a cosponsor of this bill, H. Res. 548, as a gesture of unity and bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues making ''In God We Trust'' our priority in Congress. Let us adopt the ''In God We Trust'' resolution today for our families, for our Nation, and let us encourage a public display of ''In God We Trust.''

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment about the complexity of this particular issue.

□ 1745

A simple question as to whether or not you can have a religious display during Christmas season. We have had 5–4 Supreme Court decisions saying in some cases you can, in some cases you cannot.

When and how you can pray in school. We have had cases that say sometimes you can, sometimes you cannot. The Department of Education in that case has published a pamphlet to show localities exactly what the state of the law is and how you can have certain prayers in schools, under what conditions, so that there is some guidance.

We are inviting localities and States into this quagmire without any guidance at all, just inviting lawsuits. That

is why we should show more respect for our Constitution and the Bill of Rights by voting ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Right here on our American currency, we find the motto we are debating here today, ''In God We Trust.'' There is nothing controversial about it. This is the motto that is on all American currency. It is something we live with routinely in the United States. In fact, it is one of the reasons I submit, the meaning of it, that we are the great and mighty Nation that we are today. This is not something to be afraid of or ashamed of. This is a motto we should be quite proud of and be proud to display it around the country.

As to whether the Supreme Court has come close to even ruling on ''In God We Trust,'' the reality is they have considered the national motto and its relevance and its constitutionality, and that is the basis of many of the findings in the resolution itself. There are several cases that I would refer the gentleman to and other Members who are interested in the Supreme Court's record on the national motto.

There is Lynch v. Donnelly from 1984. There is also Engel v. Vitale, which is a more recent case. There is Abington v. Schempp; Gaylor v. The United States, a more recent Supreme Court decision about displaying and teaching of the motto to public school children has a valid secular purpose.

And so our Supreme Court has ruled on this question over and over and over again. It has no relationship whatsoever to the examples that my good friend and colleague had cited. This is our national motto, not a prayer, not promotion of some religion. This is a motto about the same God, the same sentiment, the same beliefs that our Founders incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, ultimately our Constitution, that is incorporated into the prayer that we open up the House Chamber with every day and the motto which we see right before us in bronze lettering embedded in the marble right here in front of us, ''In God We Trust.''

I concede that there may be some who do not, but as a Nation, as a whole, this is not a controversial statement of any kind. This is one of the key mottos, the key phrases and statements and motto that unites us as a people and has made us the greatest country on the planet. We should not run from it. We should endorse it and embrace it and suggest that the same motto that is on the currency we spend every day is one that we are greeted with in every public building across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 548, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEKIVA WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT OF 2000

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2773

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Public Law 104–311 (110 Stat. 3818) amended section 5 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276) to require the study of the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Seminole Creek for potential inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(2) The study determined that the Wekiva River, Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek are eligible for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(3) The State of Florida has demonstrated its commitment to protecting these rivers and streams by the enactment of the Wekiva River Protection Act (Florida Statute chapter 369), by the establishment of a riparian wildlife protection zone and water quality protection zone by the St. Johns River Water Management District, and by the acquisition of lands adjacent to these rivers and streams for conservation purposes.

(4) The Florida counties of Lake, Seminole, and Orange have demonstrated their commitment to protect these rivers and streams in their comprehensive land use plans and land development regulations.

(5) The desire for designation of these rivers and streams as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system has been demonstrated through strong public support, State and local agency support, and the endorsement of designation by the Wekiva River Basin Ecosystem Working Group, which represents a broad cross section of State and local agencies, landowners, environmentalists, nonprofit organizations, and recreational users.

(6) The entire lengths of the Wekiva River, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek are held in public ownership or conservation easements or are defined as waters of the State of Florida.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF WEKIVA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, FLORIDA, AS COMPONENTS OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(161) WEKIVA RIVER, WEKIWA SPRINGS RUN, ROCK SPRINGS RUN, AND BLACK WATER CREEK, FLORIDA.—The 41.6-mile segments referred to in this paragraph, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

''(A) WEKIVA RIVER AND WEKIWA SPRINGS RUN.—The 14.9 miles of the Wekiva River, along Wekiwa Springs Run from its confluence with the St. Johns River to Wekiwa Springs, to be administered in the following classifications:

''(i) From the confluence with the St. Johns River to the southern boundary of the Lower Wekiva River State Preserve, approximately 4.4 miles, as a wild river.

''(ii) From the southern boundary of the Lower Wekiva River State Preserve to the northern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiva River, approximately 3.4 miles, as a recreational river.

''(iii) From the northern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiva River to the southern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiva River, approximately 5.9 miles, as a wild river.

''(iv) From the southern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiva River upstream along Wekiwa Springs Run to Wekiwa Springs, approximately 1.2 miles, as a recreational river.

''(B) ROCK SPRINGS RUN.—The 8.8 miles from the confluence of Rock Springs Run with the Wekiwa Springs Run forming the Wekiva River to its headwaters at Rock Springs, to be administered in the following classifications:

''(i) From the confluence with Wekiwa Springs Run to the western boundary of Rock Springs Run State Reserve at Rock Springs Run, approximately 6.9 miles, as a wild river.

''(ii) From the western boundary of Rock Springs Run State Reserve at Rock Springs Run to Rock Springs, approximately 1.9 miles, as a recreational river.

''(C) BLACK WATER CREEK.—The 17.9 miles from the confluence of Black Water Creek with the Wekiva River to outflow from Lake Norris, to be administered in the following classifications:

''(i) From the confluence with the Wekiva River to approximately .25 mile downstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing, approximately 4.1 miles, as a wild river.

''(ii) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the Seminole State Forest road to approximately .25 mile upstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing, approximately .5 mile, as a scenic river.

''(iii) From approximately .25 mile upstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing to approximately .25 mile downstream of the old railroad grade crossing (approximately River Mile 9), approximately 4.4 miles, as a wild river.

''(iv) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the old railroad grade crossing (approximately River Mile 9), upstream to the boundary of Seminole State Forest (approximately River Mile 10.6), approximately 1.6 miles, as a scenic river.

''(v) From the boundary of Seminole State Forest (approximately River Mile 10.6) to approximately .25 mile downstream of the State Road 44 crossing, approximately .9 mile, as a wild river.

''(vi) From approximately .25 mile downstream of State Road 44 to approximately .25 mile upstream of the State Road 44A crossing, approximately .6 mile, as a recreational river.

''(vii) From approximately .25 mile upstream of the State Road 44A crossing to approximately .25 mile downstream of the Lake Norris Road crossing, approximately 4.7 miles, as a wild river.

''(viii) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the Lake Norris Road crossing to the outflow from Lake Norris, approximately 1.1 miles, as a recreational river.''.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO WEKIVA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and section 5:

(1) WEKIVA RIVER SYSTEM.—The term ''Wekiva River system'' means the segments of the Wekiva River, Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida designated as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system by paragraph (161) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), as added by this Act.

(2) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee established pursuant to section 5.

(3) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The terms ''comprehensive management plan'' and ''plan'' mean the comprehensive management plan to be developed pursuant to section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) USE AUTHORIZED.—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the Wekiva River system, the Secretary shall offer to enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e), 1282(b)(1)) with the State of Florida, appropriate local political jurisdictions of the State, namely the counties of Lake, Orange, and Seminole, and appropriate local planning and environmental organizations.

(2) EFFECT OF AGREEMENT.—Administration by the Secretary of the Wekiva River system through the use of cooperative agreements shall not constitute National Park Service administration of the Wekiva River system for purposes of section 10(c) of such Act (10 U.S.C. 1281(c)) and shall not cause the Wekiva River system to be considered as being a unit of the National Park System. Publicly owned lands within the boundaries of the Wekiva River system shall continue to be managed by the agency having jurisdiction over the lands, in accordance with the statutory authority and mission of the agency.

(c) COMPLIANCE REVIEW.—After completion of the comprehensive management plan, the Secretary shall biennially review compliance with the plan and shall promptly report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate any deviation from the plan that could result in any diminution of the values for which the Wekiva River system was designated as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, staff support, and funding to assist in the development and implementation of the comprehensive management plan.

(e) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL SUPPORT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize funding for land acquisition, facility development, or operations.

SEC. 5. WEKIVA RIVER SYSTEM ADVISORY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee, to be known as the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee, to assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River system.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of a representative of each of the following agencies and organizations:

(1) The Department of the Interior, represented by the Director of the National Park Service or the Director's designee.

(2) The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.

(3) The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Parks.

(4) The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Wekiva River Aquatic Preserve.

(5) The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, Seminole State Forest.

(6) The Florida Audubon Society.

(7) The nonprofit organization known as the Friends of the Wekiva.

(8) The Lake County Water Authority.

(9) The Lake County Planning Department.

(10) The Orange County Parks and Recreation Department, Kelly Park.

(11) The Seminole County Planning Department.

(12) The St. Johns River Water Management District.

(13) The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

(14) The City of Altamonte Springs.

(15) The City of Longwood.

(16) The City of Apopka.

(17) The Florida Farm Bureau Federation.

(18) The Florida Forestry Association.

(c) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Other interested parties may be added to the Committee by request to the Secretary and unanimous consent of the existing members.

(d) APPOINTMENT.—Representatives and alternates to the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

(1) State agency representatives, by the head of the agency.

(2) County representatives, by the Boards of County Commissioners.

(3) Water management district, by the Governing Board.

(4) Department of the Interior representative, by the Southeast Regional Director, National Park Service.

(5) East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, by Governing Board.

(6) Other organizations, by the Southeast Regional Director, National Park Service.

(e) ROLE OF COMMITTEE.—The Committee shall assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River system and provide advice to the Secretary in carrying out the management responsibilities of the Secretary under this Act. The Committee shall have an advisory role only, it will not have regulatory or land acquisition authority.

(f) VOTING AND COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.—Each member agency, agency division, or organization referred to in subsection (b) shall have 1 vote and provide 1 member and 1 alternate. Committee decisions and actions will be made with consent of ¾ of all voting members. Additional necessary Committee procedures shall be developed as part of the comprehensive management plan.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act and paragraph (161) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), as added by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2773.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2773 adds the Wekiva River and many of its tributaries to the wild and scenic rivers system. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is to be commended for his bill, which is the product of extensive public involvement and has the endorsement of a variety of State, local, and Federal governments. H.R. 2773 sets apart over 40 miles of Florida rivers as wild and scenic and in doing so extends existing riparian and water protection zones.

In 1996, Mr. Speaker, Congress passed a law which directed the Secretary of the Interior to study the inclusion of these segments as wild and scenic rivers. The study has been completed and concluded that the river segments contained in this bill are eligible for inclusion into the wild and scenic rivers system. Administration of the river segments will be done by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the State of Florida and Lake, Orange, and Seminole Counties. H.R. 2773 also establishes the Wekiva River System Advisory Committee, which will assist in the development of a comprehensive management plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2773, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2773 would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make the Wekiva River in Central Florida, as well as several of its tributaries, components of the wild and scenic rivers system. Congress authorized a study of the river in 1996 to determine whether it met the criteria for addition to the wild and scenic rivers program. The study found that it did. There is a great deal of local support for conferring this status on the Wekiva; and in addition to this Federal designation, the Wekiva already benefits from important State and local protections.

During consideration of this measure by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted which made a number of technical changes to the bill, the majority of which are suggested by the National Park Service. With these changes, we support the legislation and urge our colleagues to approve H.R. 2773.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2773, the Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act. This legislation designates the Wekiva River and its tributaries for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Floridians are blessed with some of the most rich and engaging natural resources in

the world. Every year thousands of people come to Florida to enjoy the ocean as well as our many lakes and rivers. Located in Central Florida, the Wekiva River Basin in a complex ecological system of rivers, springs, lakes, and streams with many indigenous varieties of vegetation and wildlife which are dependent on this water system. Included in this area are several distinct recreational, natural, historic and cultural resources that make the Wekiva River an excellent addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. So, it is with great pride that I bring this legislation to the floor for its consideration before the House of Representatives.

First, I would like to take a moment to thank Mr. David Sukkert who brought this issue to my attention years ago. He has been an asset to my staff; illuminating the significance of this beautiful river so that the nation can recognize the environmental treasure we have in Central Florida. I would also like to thank the Friends of the Wekiva, the St. Johns Water Management District, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection who have been instrumental in this process; I truly appreciate their significant contribution to the Wekiva River.

Growing up, I spent many afternoons with my father canoeing and fishing on Florida's pristine waterways. As they were growing, I took my own sons to experience the same surroundings on the Wekiva River. In this beautiful and serene setting a multitude of species find their refuge. Avid bird watchers travel to the area to catch a glimpse of a few of the 213 different species of birds that are said to be native to the area. The Wekiva area is also home to our national bird, the bald eagle, with 4 active nests. Within the Wekiva River GEOPark, there are 6 threatened or endangered species, including the American Alligator. Not only is the Wekiva River and important wildlife refuge, it also has a deep historical importance. Scientists have found fragments of pottery dating back to the aboriginal period when the Seminole Indians lived in the area.

For more than 30 years, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act has safeguarded some of the nation's most precious rivers. In October of 1968, The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act pronounced that certain selected rivers of the nation that possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. Designated rivers receive protection to preserve their-free-flowing condition, to protect the water quality and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

In the 104th Congress, I introduced legislation which was signed into law to authorize a study of the Wekiva River by the Department of Interior to determine whether it would be eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The National Parks Service completed this study and concluded that the Wekiva River system was an excellent candidate for receiving this designation.

This legislation would allow the Wekiva and its tributaries to join the Loxahatchee as Florida's second river to receive this designation. The Wekiva Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1999 provides Congressional designation of 41.6 miles of eligible and suitable portions of the Wekiva River, Rock Springs Run, Wekiwa Springs Run, and Black Water Creek with State management and the establishment of a coordinated Federal, State, and local management committee. As the report states, the Wekiva River area provides ''outstandingly remarkable resources'' which makes it eligible for this national designation.

Therefore, I thank Congressmen HANSEN and YOUNG for their efforts in bringing this measure to the floor. I enthusiastically support H.R. 2773, the Wekiva Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this important legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2773, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4700.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4700, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The de novo vote on H.R. 2773 is postponed until tomorrow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—376

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Thune	Visclosky	Weller
Thurman	Vitter	Wexler
Tiahrt	Walden	Weygand
Toomey	Walsh	Whitfield
Towns	Wamp	Wicker
Traficant	Watt (NC)	Wilson
Turner	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Udall (CO)	Waxman	Woolsey
Udall (NM)	Weiner	Wu
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Wynn
Velazquez	Weldon (PA)	Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Chenoweth-Hage

NOT VOTING—57

Armey	Hilleary	Porter
Baca	Jenkins	Rahall
Barton	Kennedy	Rogan
Bateman	Lampson	Salmon
Burton	Lazio	Sessions
Clay	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Coburn	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Cook	McIntosh	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Meeks (NY)	Spence
Danner	Menendez	Stark
Doolittle	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Engel	Mollohan	Sweeney
Ewing	Morella	Taylor (NC)
Fattah	Murtha	Tierney
Fowler	Norwood	Vento
Franks (NJ)	Ose	Waters
Gilman	Owens	Watkins
Granger	Payne	Wise
Hefley	Pombo	Young (FL)

□ 1828

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, due to a public forum in my district today, I was absent for the vote on H.R. 4700, legislation to grant consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative for H.R. 4700.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1167. An act to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

MAKING IN ORDER ON JULY 25, 2000, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 99, DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF MOST FAVORED NATION TRADING STATUS TO VIETNAM

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on July 25, 2000, or any day thereafter, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, with respect to Vietnam; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to the joint resolution and a Member in support of the joint resolution; that pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion; and that the provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam for the remainder of the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, let me say it is the intention of this unanimous consent request that the 1 hour of debate be yielded fairly between Members of the majority and minority parties on both sides of this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 562) providing for the concurrence by the House, with amendments, in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1167.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1167) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes, and the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendments:

(1) Page 14, line 12, strike ''(or of such other agency)''.

(2) Page 15, line 1, insert ''so'' after ''functions''.

(3) Page 19, line 4, insert ''other provisions of law,'' after ''section 106''.

(4) Page 20, line 6, strike ''305'' and insert ''505''.

(5) Page 31, line 23, strike ''may'' and insert ''is authorized to''.

(6) Page 39, strike lines 7 through 14, and insert the following:

''(g) WAGES.—All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors (excluding tribes and tribal organizations) in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting or decorating of a building or other facilities in connection with construction projects funded by the United States under this Act shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing wages on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494). With respect to construction alteration, or repair work to which the Act of March 3, 1931, is applicable under this section, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in the Reorganization Plan numbered 14, of 1950, and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 948).

(7) Page 39, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 40, line 6, and insert the following:

''Regarding construction programs or projects, the Secretary and Indian tribes may negotiate for the inclusion of specific provisions of the Office of Federal Procurement and Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) and Federal acquisition regulations in any funding agreement entered into under this part. Absent a negotiated agreement, such provisions and regulatory requirements shall not apply.

(8) Page 41, line 1, insert a comma after ''Executive orders''.

(9) Page 49, strike lines 4 through 10.

(10) Page 56, beginning on line 21, strike ''for fiscal years 2000 and 2001''.

(11) Page 60, line 6, strike ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''.

(12) Page 60, strike lines 9 and 10.

(13) Page 60, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 65, line 16.

(14) Page 65, line 17, strike ''**SEC. 13.**'' and insert ''**SEC. 12.**''.

(15) Page 66, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, the provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous materials, on H. Res. 562.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation that we have been working on for 4 years. H.R. 1167, the proposed Tribal Self-Governance Amendments of 2000, creates a new title in the 1975 Indian Self-Determination Act, a statute which allows Indian tribes to contract for or take over the administration and operation of certain Federal programs which provide services to Indian tribes.

Subsequent amendments created title III in the 1975 act to provide for a self-governance demonstration project within the Indian Health Service which allows for large scale tribal self-governance compliance and funding agreements on a demonstration basis.

H.R. 1167 makes this demonstration contracting program permanent for certain programs contracted within the IHS if this legislation is enacted into law.

Indian and Alaskan native tribes will be able to contract for the operation,

control and redesign of various IHS activities on a permanent basis. In short, what was a demonstration project would become a permanent IHS self-governance program. Tribes which have already contracted for IHS services under existing law will continue under the provisions of their contracts while an additional 50 new tribes would be selected each year to enter into contracts.

H.R. 1167 also allows for a feasibility study regarding the execution of tribal self-governance compacts and funding agreements of Indian-related programs outside the IHS but within the Department of Health and Human Services on a demonstration project basis.

H.R. 1167 is an important piece of legislation which is a result of extensive negotiations between the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Indian Affairs in the other body, the Indian Health Service, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and a special task force representing the many Indian tribes around the Nation.

After negotiations and some minor changes, we have all reached agreement. It is my understanding that H. Res. 562, as it is now being considered by us today, incorporates H.R. 1167 as it has been agreed to by everybody working on the bill, including administration officials and tribal representatives.

I support this legislation as we have amended it and urge my colleagues to pass it today and send it back to the other body so that the other body will again have the opportunity to pass it in its final form and send it to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters for inclusion in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2000.

Hon. TOM BLILEY
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On November 17, 1999, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1167, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes. This noncontroversial bill had been referred solely to the Committee on Resources. On April 4, 2000, the Senate amended the bill and returned it to the House. Section 12 of the Senate amendments establishes the office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Health in the Department of Health and Human Services. I believe this provision affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, as demonstrated by the referral of H.R. 403, which accomplishes the same end, to the Committee on Resources and additionally to the Committee on Commerce.

I propose to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1167 with an amendment which would strip out Section 12. I ask your cooperation in allowing this to occur when we return after the Memorial Day district work period. My understanding is that the Senate would then take up the amended version of H.R. 1167 and send it to the President for signature.

Of course, by allowing this to occur, the Committee on Commerce does not waive its jurisdiction over Section 12 or any other similar matter. If the Senate insists on its amendments and requests a conference, I would support the Committee on Commerce's request to be named to the conference. Finally, this action should not be seen as precedent for any other Senate amendments to Committee on Resources bills which affect the Committee on Commerce's jurisdiction. I would be pleased to place this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the bill on the Floor to document this agreement.

I appreciate your cooperation in moving this bill, which is very important to the Native American community.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2000.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: Thank you for your recent letter regarding H.R. 1167, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes. As you know, Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives grants the Committee on Commerce jurisdiction over public health and quarantine. Accordingly, you are correct in your conclusion that section 12 of H.R. 1167, as amended by the Senate, falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Because of the importance of this legislation and your commitment to strike those matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce when the bill comes to the floor, I will not exercise the Committee's right to a sequential referral. I appreciate your acknowledgment that by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on Commerce does not waive its prerogatives with respect to this legislation or similar legislation, including authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. Thank you for your commitment to support any request by the Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 1167 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time this important piece to the ongoing struggle for Indian tribes to provide governmental services to their membership has been before us. This bill provides a process through which tribes shall step into the shoes of the Federal Government and administer programs to their members previously run by the Indian Health Service.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 105th Congress and again just last November when we passed H.R. 1167. The bill has passed the Senate, and today we are here to agree to changes we have worked out with the Senate. This is one of, if not the most, important pieces of legislation this Congress will pass affecting American Indian tribes as it reaffirms our commitment to tribal self-governance.

The nature of self-governance is rooted in the inherent sovereignty of American Indian and Alaska Native tribes. From the founding of this Nation, Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages have been recognized as distinct, independent, political communities exercising powers of self-government, not by virtue of any delegation of powers from the Federal Government but rather by virtue of their innate sovereignty. The tribes' sovereignty predates the founding of the United States and its Constitution and forms the backdrop against which the United States has continually entered into a relationship with Indian tribes and Native villages.

We did not make any changes to the bill as it passed the Senate. We decided to delete a section of the bill relating to the application of the FLRA, which is further addressed in the more appropriate setting. Language included in the bill permits tribes to receive waivers from certain regulations to help tribes administer certain programs. We are all agreed, however, that this language does not alter the obligation of the Indian tribes to comply fully with the laws enacted by Congress.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and all the members of the committee and all of the Indian tribes who worked so hard on this legislation, the Indian Health Service, and our friends in the other body who labored long and hard to get us where we are today, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for his leadership and support on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 562.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEKIVA WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2773, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2773, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING OUR HEROES, JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is a time of remembrance and deep appreciation. It was 2 years ago that we lost our brave friends, J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson. As we recall their sacrifices, I wish to place the accomplishments of these two great heroes into a larger context.

The shock of tragedy we all felt at their loss has grown into the deeper pain of longing. We wonder how can it be that God chooses to allow tragedy to visit the homes of good people, people we honor, love and respect? This we cannot know.

Scripture teaches that God pursues his own purpose in his own time.

But there are questions we can answer. What did these men live for? What drove them to revere their work and to carry out their duty even in the face of terrible danger?

The simple truth is that they lived to defend freedom that is cherished and loved by us all. This passion for liberty is the foundation of our democracy. It is the sturdiest support upholding democracy across the globe.

These officers loved their jobs despite the risks because they embraced a broader commitment to a most noble purpose. In doing so, Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut have taken their place in the continuum of freedom.

From the New England farmers who routed the British on the road to Saratoga to the volunteers who marched south to San Antonio, as the determined men who charged into destiny at Gettysburg, Americans have always answered freedom's summons. From the fearless defenders of Corregidor, to the besieged ranks of guarding the Chosin Reservoir, to the GIs in the heat of the Ia Drang Valley, the call has been answered.

From our sailors under the strange stars of distant oceans, to our pilots flying above the hostile lights of unfamiliar lands, the work of freedom goes on. From the Marine stationed at a tiny embassy in a strife-torn nation, to the officers on duty today under the dome of this Capitol, the tradition endures and America goes on.

It is a continuous line of Americans demanding the most from themselves, freedom for our Nation and the best for this world.

This unwavering commitment is the foundation of our democracy.

In Paul's letter to the Corinthians he states, ''If any man builds on this foundation using gold, silver or costly stones, wood, hay or straw, his work will be shown for what it is because the day will bring it to light. It will be revealed with fire and the fire will test the quality of each man's work. If what he has built survives, he will receive his reward.''

Mr. Speaker, these men were tested. They endured the flames. Their work still stands, and I know in my heart that having received their reward they are now enjoying a peace and joy beyond our worldly understanding.

God bless John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut and their families. Let us never forget their awesome sacrifice.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INDONESIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the widespread violence and killing of innocent people occurring daily in the Malukus, the Spice Islands and Ambon in Indonesia.

The mass killings in Ambon are deeply disturbing. There are members within the current Indonesia government and former government and the military who do not care how many innocent lives are stamped out. These people simply care about their ultimate goal of controlling Indonesian society and keeping their hold on power. It is deeply disturbing and offensive, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals would allow this. They are in the same league as those who ordered the deaths of innocent people in the concentration camps of World War II.

Horrifying reports and photos arrive each day in my office. I have photos of destroyed homes, businesses, churches, places of worship. I have photos of men, women, children, lying in streets with severed limbs, heads blown off, photos much too graphic to bring to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Indonesia at the end of May, met with various leaders, including President Wahid and leaders from both the Christian and Muslim communities.

□ 1845

They long for peace to reign again. But it seems impossible because of numerous reports of behind-the-scenes maneuvers by Suharto, Habibie, their cronies, various military officers and others who want to destabilize the present government.

These former government leaders and military leaders are really people with no hearts. Why do I say that? Because only uncivilized people could coldly and callously calculate to cause the deaths of whole societies simply to maintain their power.

Mr. Speaker, the mass killings continue. Day after day, more and more people in these islands become refugees with no access to food, clothing, medicine or shelter.

Reports suggest that the tension in the Malukus is not simply an economic issue; it is a religious issue as well. Members of the more extremist Islamic community, including the current leader of the People's Consultative Assembly, Dr. Amien Rais, openly have supported calls for ''jihad'' or an Islamic holy war against the Christians and other religious minorities in Indonesia.

The influx of Laskar Jihad fighters into Maluku has only happened through complexity of members of the military who have allowed a mass influx of men and arms into the Ambonese communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a couple of excerpts from letters and reports that we have received:

''Before the military arrived, we were fine. There was no fighting. They came and the attacks came with them. When we were boarding the evacuation ship, the soldiers had stolen most of our things, including our rings, necklaces, et cetera, and sold them in front of us for almost nothing. A chain saw that costs several hundred dollars was sold for $10. If we carried two bags of clothes to bring, they threw one out. We took only part of what we had fled with. The clothes I have on are the only ones I now own. This shirt I wore during the attacks. I had no long pants.''

''For the 3 days of the fighting, soldiers were shooting at us, many of them died. Two of our kids died. One was handicapped, and the soldiers hung him and burned him alive. These two had not died in the fighting; it was after when the soldiers rounded us up. The soldiers murdered these two.''

''The attacks continued until the evening the 3rd of July in the village. The next day, the attack continued. When it was known that the mobs planned to burn down the university, the villagers again asked the military's help to stop the mobs. Again, the request was ignored with the excuse that there are villagers, civil security personnel, and the students regiment who could guard the university campus.''

Here is an AP article from July 17: ''The leaders of an armed Muslim militia have vowed to rid the islands of Christians. Most members come from

Indonesia's central island of Java, and its leaders are Suharto supporters. In the television footage, many of the Muslim militants can be clearly heard speaking Javanese as they plan their attack on Christian parts of Ambon.

''In television footage shot over the weekend . . . Indonesian soldiers are seen fighting alongside hundreds of Muslim militants in Ambon. Many of the extremists were filmed carrying military-issue assault rifles.''

Mr. Speaker, out of desperation, many community leaders from Ambon have urged the international community to help stop these continued killings by bringing in U.N. observers and peacekeepers and boycotting Indonesian businesses involved in supporting the destruction of the Malukus.

Mr. Speaker, we should not stand idly by and watch while the death count continues to rise. Our Nation should not do business with businesses supporting this bloodshed. We are starting our military assistance again. We should not lend our military expertise to military officers who approve of the killing of innocent women and children. We have laws that impose sanctions on Nations that allow persecution of ethnic and religious groups.

I call on Members to join me in sending a letter to President Wahid and President Clinton. I call on the Indonesian and U.S. Governments to act immediately to stop the killings and bring to justice the parties responsible for this reign of terror.

A TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN FRANKLIN DILLINGHAM III

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor one of the most outstanding citizens of San Diego, California.

Benjamin Franklin Dillingham III, or Ben as he is known to his many friends in San Diego, will be honored this Sunday at a community tribute banquet in San Diego. A community leader and philanthropist; former chief of staff to our mayor, Maureen O'Connor; a captain in the United States Marine Corps; Ben is currently serving as chief financial officer for Patient Care Incorporated, reflecting his deep interest in providing quality health care for all.

Ben was born in Honolulu, a fourth generation islander. His father, Ben II, was the general manager of the Oahu Railway and Land Company. His mother, Frances Andrews, is the daughter of Vice Admiral and Mrs. Adolphus Andrews of Denison, Texas.

Ben received his B.A. degree cum laude and his master's in business administration both from Harvard University. Upon graduation from Harvard Business School with distinction, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps; and while in Vietnam, he was promoted to first lieutenant.

When he returned to the United States, he began training recruits at Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego and was promoted to captain while at MCRD. He was given orders to Advanced Armor School conducted by the United States Army at Fort Knox and graduated, typically, at the top of his class before returning to duty with the Marines. Ben finished his service as a division training officer and then drove across country to establish residence in San Diego, California.

Here in San Diego, he was recognized as a true community leader. Prior to his work as chief of staff for the mayor, he also worked for General Dynamics, Convair Division, and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board.

Mr. Speaker, his service to the community is broad and spans a number of organizations. He has served as a member of the Marine Corps Association, the United States Armor Association, the Navy League, the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, the Center for Social Services, the Greater San Diego Business Association, the Metropolitan Community Church of San Diego, the United Way, the Diversity Committee, the San Diego Human Dignity Foundation, the San Diego Scholarship Foundation, and the County AIDS Service Advisory Panel.

He has been a board chair of the AIDS Foundation of San Diego and the County of San Diego AIDS Services Advisory Panel, and he has served as a board member of the Episcopal Community Services, L.I.F.E. Foundation, AIDS Project, and the San Diego Scholarship Foundation.

Aside from all of these memberships and board leaderships, he has numerous honors from across the city. His military awards include the Bronze Star Medal with Combat ''V'' for Vietnam Service and the Army Commendation Medal at the Armor Officer Advance Course at Fort Knox. His civilian recognition includes Man of the Year, the San Diego Lesbian/Gay Pride Festival; the Human Rights Campaign Fund Crystal Torch Award; the Log Cabin Club Pursuit of Happiness Award; the Brad Truax Presidential Award; the Stan Berry Award; and the Harvey Milk Memorial Award at the Nickys; the Harvey Milk Democratic Club Human Rights Award, and the San Diego AIDS Project Celebration of Life Award.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Ben Dillingham III for his tenacity in the fight for progressive causes; his commitment to the struggle for human rights; his belief in the importance of access to government, education, and health care for every member of our society; his outstanding service to the City of San Diego; and his significant contribution to our community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to call Ben my friend.

CELEBRATING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are now celebrating the 10th year anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. I rise this evening to not only celebrate this landmark occasion, but also to acknowledge my unwavering support of the Americans with Disabilities Act, known as ADA, and the future of this legislation.

Just a few days ago, I signed a pledge of support for the American Association of People With Disabilities, thereby affirming my belief that we need an America that lives up to the promise of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all.

The ADA advocates for our Nation's more than 43 million citizens with disabilities. In the Seventh District of Illinois, there are over 35,000 people with disabilities under the age of 65, and over 20,000 people with disabilities 65 years or older.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a few thoughts regarding the principles of the ADA and its successes over the last 10 years.

First of all, the ADA seeks to break down stereotypes and misconceptions about people with disabilities by including them in the progress and prosperity of our Nation. Equal opportunity, full participation in society, employment opportunities, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency are the guiding principles of the ADA.

Today, we are seeing a more inclusive and integrated society as a result of the ADA. People with disabilities are getting jobs that they want and for which they are well qualified. The Global Strategy Group Survey found in October of 1995 that 75 percent of companies with 51 to 200 employees are now hiring people with disabilities. From 1991 to 1994, 800,000 persons with severe disabilities joined the workforce. Public transportation changes and curb cuts are widespread. Accommodations in hotels, restaurants, and stores are becoming more and more accessible. Telecommunications for people who are deaf and hard of hearing is becoming a reality. People who are blind can receive information in a format they can use.

So successes from the ADA are visible today, and I hope that we continue to use these gains as a baseline for future work to liberate those who live in confining conditions and who want to be more integrated into society.

Mr. Speaker, along that line, I am pleased to note that I am the sponsor of the MiCASSA bill, which would bring our Nation's Medicaid system into accord with the principles set forth by the ADA. This bill will allow individuals with developmental and other disabilities to use Medicaid funding for home-based and community-

based services, not just for confining medical institutions. I believe this will strengthen the existing infrastructure set forth by the ADA and the Developmental Disabilities Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are not yet where we want to be, but thank God we are not where we were 10 years ago. We still have much progress to make. However, I am pleased to be here today to offer my unwavering support for our people who live and work daily with disabilities. I am proud that as a result of the ADA, many people with disabilities are now thriving, productive members of society, and looking forward to the future with glee and anticipation.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL KAREN DIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and congratulate a real American heroine, Lieutenant Colonel Karen Dixon, who hails from the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland. I was honored to attend a pinning and promotion ceremony for Lieutenant Colonel Dixon last Friday at the Women's Military Service Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington Virginia. During this ceremony, Lieutenant Colonel Dixon was promoted from the rank of Major to Lieutenant Colonel.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon is the ninth child of 11 children born to Alice and James Dixon. Of those 11 children, four have served in the military. She is an honors graduate of Catonsville High School and received several awards and served as a member of the All-State cross country team. She received a bachelor of arts degree in social work from Bennett College, where she was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Army Signal Corps upon selection as a distinguished military graduate. In 1995, she received a master's of arts degree in management from Webster University.

Mr. Speaker, during her tenure in the Army, she has served in many capacities. She currently is assigned as a Department of the Army Systems Acquisition Management Coordinator, assigned to the Secretary of the Army's staff. Her next assignment is Chief of the Headquarters Branch, Joint Headquarters Regional Subcommand, NATO in Greece.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon is an American soldier, a person of capability and ideals. She has dedicated her life to an American Army that always must remain true to its principles, an Army that must always conduct itself with fairness. She understands that our commitment to fairness and merit is our strength. She has served this Nation well. And in the process, she has learned that no one gives us our freedom; it must be earned. No one guarantees fairness that we ourselves are not willing to affirm, even if that requires some personal risk on our part.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon understands that life is a struggle, but she is an American. She believes that when we persevere, fairness will ultimately prevail. The United States military is remarkable among the great fighting forces of the modern world.

□ 1900

More often than not, the young people who have defended us and, all too often, have made the ultimate sacrifice have done so as volunteers.

Last March, President Clinton applauded the service and achievements of all the women who have put on the uniform of the United States and fought for their country. As the President also recognized, however, obstacles to hard-earned recognition all too often remain, in the military and in civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to build a military which is as diverse as this wonderful Nation. Never again should gender predetermine a person's opportunity to serve.

The ideals of American women and men, our commitment to freedom, to equality and fairness, have made this country the strongest in the world. We must never forget that. Fairness is the foundation of our freedom.

Today, we acknowledge Lieutenant Colonel Karen Dixon for her competence and her commitment to American ideals and for her tremendous service.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon has demonstrated that merit will be recognized and fairness will prevail if we persevere. By her actions, she has shown that a commitment to fairness remains the foundation of America's strength. That is why I am so honored to represent Lieutenant Colonel Dixon in the Congress of the United States of America.

APPLAUDING LEADERSHIP IN ADVOCACY OF RIGHTS OF DISABLED PERSONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my congratulations and recognize the Presidential Task Force on Employment of Adults with Disabilities and the American Association of People With Disabilities.

I rise today to applaud the leadership that has been shown in the advocacy for the rights of the disabled, the mentally and physically challenged.

I am delighted to be able to salute the spirit of the ADA torch relay which evidences that we all are created equal. I join my colleagues who have come to this floor to acknowledge that when this country speaks of equality and in its Declaration of Independence, when it offers to the American people the opportunity for equality and a good quality of life, they speak of everyone no matter what one's position in life and what one's ability.

The people who are physically challenged and mentally challenged have shown us that it is not limiting in their spirit or their ability to achieve. I am very gratified that they continue to press their point of equality and justice.

I believe it is important that we in the United States Congress support the Americans with Disabilities Act in its reauthorization and its implementation. It is important that the businesses of America recognize that they are advantaged by hiring individuals with disabilities.

I recall making a speech some few weeks ago, and I spoke about America's greatness and its diversity. I remember being reminded by someone who came to me in a wheelchair never to forget that diversity is also reflected in Americans with disabilities. Just a few weeks ago, that very same person came to the United States Congress along with 20 other representatives from the community of individuals who are disabled.

Unfortunately, this own Capitol, our own Capitol was very hard for them to access, but, nevertheless, they were not frustrated, they did not yield, and they persisted in getting into the United States Capitol that belongs to all of the American people.

I think it is important that we allow people with disabilities to be independent, and that is why I supported legislation that would not diminish their benefits if they worked, for we all deserve that affirmation that we are able to support ourselves and to stand for ourselves.

I would hope that we, as the United States Congress and the American people, will continue to promote and enhance those who are physically challenged and who may be mentally challenged. People with disabilities are our friends, our brothers, our family members, our sisters, mothers and fathers and our children. They deserve our affirmation.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I rise and affirm them and congratulate them for persisting on the grounds of their own equality, and I seek to have this United States Congress and our legislative initiatives continue to affirm opportunities for them in providing opportunities for them to work and as well making sure that the resources that they earn still allow them to have good health care, good educational resources, good housing.

Again, I implore American businesses to find the talented among Americans with disabilities and for all of us to make sure that everywhere is accessible to all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

H.R. 4921 AMENDING TITLE 38 TO ENSURE THAT ALL VETERANS EXPOSED TO IONIZING RADIATION ARE CONSIDERED IN FULL FOR THEIR DISABILITY CLAIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to enable veterans exposed to radiation to be considered for medical assistance without regard to their particular level of exposure. The bill, also, expands the definition of radiation-risk activity to include veterans exposed to residual contamination.

The destroyer U.S.S. Brush entered the waters of the Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands, an area contaminated with radiation from a large number of ships that had served as targets during two atmospheric nuclear tests. Crew members of the U.S.S. Brush ate fish and drank water distilled from the bay and crew members made trips to the target vessels to retrieve souvenirs. There was no dosimetry data collected on the U.S.S. Brush or at the Kwajalein Atoll to determine levels of exposure. No safety precautions were taken to prevent exposure and the crew was unaware of the dangers of ionizing radiation.

Veterans who served on the U.S.S. Brush now suffer from a number of diseases that can be linked to radiation exposure. However, their disability claims have repeatedly been denied because they were not onsite participants in an atmospheric nuclear test and they were exposed to low levels of ionizing radiation.

Congress has assisted veterans exposed to radiation in the past. In 1988 Congress passed the Radiation-Exposed Veterans Compensation Act (PL 100–321). This law covered veterans which participated in a radiation risk activity. The law has three definitions of radiation risk activity. They include: onsite participation in a nuclear detonation, occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan, by United States forces during the period beginning on August 6, 1945 and ending on July 1, 1946, and internment as a prisoner of war in Japan during WWII which resulted in the opportunity for exposure to ionizing radiation comparable to that of veterans occupying Hiroshima or Nagasaki. Clearly, this language does not cover those veterans exposed to radiation while in the service of their country.

VA claims that lab tests on these veterans show that levels of residual radiation are not sufficient to sustain their claims for disability. However, these dose levels were based on lab tests, not data collected on sight at the Kwajalein Atoll. This is important because Congress has previously concluded that determining the level of exposure, unless collected onsite, is a futile exercise. Disability claims must be considered without regard to whether any particular level of radiation was measured for that individual especially when exposure is not denied.

Congress must act to ensure that veterans exposed to ionizing radiation either on site or residually be considered for benefits. Without this legislation radiation exposed veterans do not have a realistic chance of proving their disability claim. I urge my colleagues to support our veterans by co-sponsoring this bill.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to go basically over what the comments that I am going to make this evening, but I guess it would be appropriate to make a couple comments about this weekend back in Colorado.

First of all, I would like to express deep appreciation for all the firemen and the firefighters that are so courageously fighting the forest fires that we have out there in Colorado.

As many of my colleagues know, my district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That district geographically is larger than the State of Florida. It is essentially all the mountains of the State of Colorado. As one can guess, it is the highest district in the United States. So we have a lot of lightning strikes and so on.

We do have a major fire down at Mesa Verde National Park down at the Four Corners of Colorado. Right now it has consumed about 17,000 acres. The conditions are very tough to fight the fire. But we have got a lot of volunteer firefighters. We have a got a lot of volunteers from the community. We, of course, have our own fire fighting teams. We have got the bombers in there. We have got the helicopter pilots. We just have a lot of cooperation out there in Colorado. So I thank my colleagues for their expressions of support, and I do want to express my deep appreciation for all of the people out there in Colorado who are helping get an upper hand on the fires right there in their Third Congressional District.

Second thing I would like to mention to my colleagues before I go into my comments, and that is I had the privilege Friday of speaking at a service for a Colorado State patrolman, Captain Fred Bitterman. Captain Bitterman was a well-respected officer of the Colorado State Patrol.

I used to be a police officer. I used to know the captain. Of course, I was not on the State Patrol. I was a city police officer.

The service was a very moving service. He has a wonderful family. His commitment to the State of Colorado, his commitment to the Colorado State Patrol, his commitment to his friends, his commitment to the communities was all well represented at that service.

We are going to miss him. The captain did a good job. He was a very, very good man. I have entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a congressional tribute in honor of the service that he gave to us. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to address three fundamental subjects, and they are fundamental especially for the younger generations of this country. For the people that are, say, below 45, 45 and under. We hear a lot of discussions going on, but what is the real focus for the future?

There are three items that I would like to talk about that I think focus on the future that our young people that are under 45 years of age should take special interest in, because I think our generation over 45 years of age owes something to this generation, not owes in the way of a giveaway, but owes in the way that we have a responsibility to move this country forward in such a fashion that these three elements have some sense of protection or some sense of right direction for the generation that follows us.

The first topic that I am going to visit with tonight is this death tax. Then I am going to move from the death tax into the marriage penalty. Then from the marriage penalty, I would like to talk about Social Security. In all three of these areas, there is a distinct difference between what the administration, President Clinton and AL GORE, are advocating and what is being advocated by the Bush team. I think it is fair to reflect on those this evening when I have these discussions with my colleagues.

Let me first of all begin on the death tax. As my colleagues know, I have spoken several times on this House floor in regards to what that death tax does and how devastating it is in this community. What has been of interest is the people opposed to this, including the Clinton administration, and, by the way, I refer specifically to the administration's policies, because I want my colleagues to know here in the House of Representatives we actually had 65 Democrats who voted to eliminate the death tax. So here in the House we have had a bipartisan effort, both Democrats and Republicans, going out there and recognizing just how punitive, how punishing the death tax is.

Well, since the debate started taking place on this several weeks ago, I have noted a number of different comments in our national press. One thing that is of special interest, I think, or a counterpoint I guess one would make, my point being that the death tax is devastating for a community as a whole; and the counterpoint that is being put out there by some of the liberal media writers I guess one would say is, wait a minute, all this does is favors the wealthy in this country.

Well, I want to talk about what I call the trickle-down impact of what that death tax does, not only just in a community, but what it does to family farms and family ranches.

For example, right here, we will have a family ranch. Now, I can tell my colleagues that most working ranches, at least the ones I am familiar with, and I have been on a lot of ranches in my career, but most of the family ranches

that I am familiar with in Colorado are what we call working ranches. What we mean by a working ranch is that the family actually has to make a living off the ranch. They do not own the ranch for the beauty or the esthetics of having a ranch. They own it because that is how they provide a living for their family.

One of the assumptions that is being made by some of the opponents of this, including the Clinton administration, who seems to think that if one owns a ranch in Colorado or a ranch in Wyoming or a farm in Georgia or a farm in Kansas, that one automatically should be classified as the wealthy people of this country and one should be punished upon the event of one's death.

In other words, the Clinton administration says that death is a taxable event. In fact, the Clinton administration feels so strongly that death should be a taxable event that this year in President Clinton's budget that he has sent to us, the administration's budget, they actually call for an increase in the death tax, an increase in the death tax.

We clearly, including the Republicans and 65 Democrats, have a fundamental difference with the administration Clinton-Gore in that we do not believe that death should be a taxable event.

Well, let us go back to that working family or working ranch out there in my district since that is where I am the most familiar. Some of these people are saying, well, you go out there and tell these people to buy life insurance, you know, go out, and that way, when they pass away, because the government, frankly, the administration has pushed this as a taxable event, why you will have the life insurance. Upon the death of the owner of the ranch, why it is no problem. The life insurance pays the government these taxes.

Well, do my colleagues know what? That is based on an assumption that these working family farms and ranches in Colorado and elsewhere in this country make enough money to pay the premiums to buy the life insurance. Do my colleagues know something? Most of the farmers and ranchers that I know in my district no more have the money which would be, by the way, several tens and tens of thousands of dollars at a minimum every year just for the premiums, they no more have that money than they do extra cash in the bank.

What happens when one keeps this death tax? Oh, sure, one may think that one is going after the Rockefellers or the Carnegies or the Kennedys or the people like that, the Forbes or the Gates in our country, but, in fact, those are the families who have their money and the resources to do estate planning. They have their foundations and so on. So one would be surprised at the minimal impact there is on those families.

Where the impact is is these families that have, for example, as one says, has land, and they work it as a ranch in Colorado, but when they die, the land all of a sudden which has appreciated in value, after all, the one family I am speaking of, they have had the family ranch for 125 years, there has been an appreciation in that 125 years.

Well, what happens? The only thing that can possibly happen is that that ranch is going to cease to exist. There is no choice. The death tax is devastating on family farms and family ranches in this country.

Is this country not in the business of encouraging family farms and family ranches from going from one generation to the next generation? Is that not what our policy should be? Should not we stand up and say, hey, in America, in America, we want these farms to go from one generation to the next?

But that is not what is happening in this great country. What is happening in this country is, as long as we have that death tax in existence, we are discouraging, not encouraging, we are discouraging the possibility that that family farm will pass to the next generation.

□ 1915

And is that really the policy that we want? Clearly, some of my colleagues over here, who have supported the Gore/Clinton policy, actually want an increase in the death tax. They support that budget. But 65 of the Democrats and all the Republicans have said, wait a minute, we should be, in this country, in the business of encouraging that this goes from one generation to the next generation.

The other thing that I want to bring up that is being widely ignored by the critics and the media, who are criticizing us because we are saying that death should not be a taxable event, the media that is criticizing us for saying that death should not be a taxable event are ignoring something. They keep coming out and saying this is for the wealthy. Well, take a look at what it does to a community.

For example, I know a small community in Colorado where there was a fairly wealthy individual, the person was a millionaire in that community, and upon his untimely death the Government came in and taxed his death. And what did they do with that money? Did they keep it in that small community? Of course the Government did not allow that money to stay in the community. It was not enough for the Government to take it away from someone they said was a wealthy person; and by the way, to qualify for that, if someone is a contractor, for instance, all they have to really do is own a bulldozer, a dump truck, and a backhoe and they have to worry about estate taxes.

Let us look closely at that logic. Citizen A is very wealthy. Let us follow the logic. Now, I do not agree with the logic, but let us follow the logic some of my colleagues have. Their logic is just simply because the person is wealthy, based on that fact alone, just because they are wealthy, we should tax them on their death. Well, if we follow that logic, then we should say, okay, tax the wealthy person, punish them, go after them simply because they are wealthy.

Then what is done with the money? As my colleagues know, this money does not stay here in the community. It does not stay in this community and continue to go to the local church, or charities or help provide jobs or create capital or create investment in that community. That money is sucked out of that small community; and it all goes east, to Washington, D.C., where the bureaucracy takes it and redistributes it, takes the money from the small communities, whether in Kansas or out in California or up in Wyoming or Montana or Idaho, takes the money from those death-taxed estates and takes it out of those communities and ships it to Washington, D.C., back here in the East, and then it is redistributed. And that has a very negative impact.

What these editorial writers who support the death tax, what they should put in their editorials is not what it does to the wealthy family, although in fairness they should say what it does to a small business owner or a rancher or a farmer; but they ought to be fair and talk about what happens to that next generation. They also ought to be fair to the rest of the community where that individual lives and talk about what happens to that community, especially a small community where that money is sucked out of the community and sent to the East. Obviously, it has a very negative impact.

I thought I would bring up a couple articles here and read them for my colleagues. I do not like to read verbatim, but I would just like to just speak to these because I think these are important.

Every June for the past 8 years Jeannie Mizell, owner and manager of Mizell Lumber & Hardware Company, has sent the Government a check for $19,000. She will have to continue to send that check for the next 7 years. This money is not income tax on profits; the money is because the company is profitable. It has been in business for 78 years, 78 years in that community and in her family. It is the price that she is being forced to pay by the Government because she inherited the hardware store from her father and her mother.

''It is not a very pleasant feeling to get that letter in the mail every May,'' says Mizell, speaking of the Federal death tax bill. ''My father, who joined with his father in the family business in 1947, worked very hard, 6 days a week for 37 years, and he paid his taxes every year on time. He did not owe any past taxes and he should have been able to keep the money he accumulated and pass it on to the next generation so that our generation could have an opportunity to have the lumber company and the hardware company.''

Instead, after her parents died, the Federal Government steps in and nails them with a death tax of over $300,000; with another $45,000 which had to be spent by Mrs. Mizell just to get the appraisal done of the lumber company so the Federal Government could figure out just exactly how much money they wanted out of that estate. That is what the death tax does.

By the way, this is not Home Depot we are talking about. This is a small family hardware and lumber business. This is what is being punished out there. If my colleagues think Home Depot is going to suffer as a result of the death of one of their founders, they are not. They have got the planning; they have the resources to plan for it. It is the small lumber companies, the small families in small-town America that is being punished by these death taxes.

Here is another one. ''My name is Leanne Ferris. My family lives in the central part of Idaho. Our family's cattle ranch is 45 miles northeast of the Sun Valley area and the Lost River Valley. The ranch consists of 2,600 deeded acres and a cow-calf operation with 700 head of cattle.

''My youngest brother, Ross, lives with and manages the ranch with my mother. Although I'm still very involved in the ranch, my husband and I also operate a design business in Ketchum, Idaho. My brothers and sister and I all grew up working alongside my mother and my father and my grandfather. We worked weekends and holidays and summers branding and moving cattle, riding the range and fixing fences. We didn't have a lot of material things, but we had our family, we had the land, and we had the lifestyle.

''On October 5, 1993, my father was accidentally killed when his clothing got caught in a farm machine. He was 71 years old, and he was very healthy. He worked from dawn to dusk and he loved the land. He loved his family. We all worked as a team. We were always a very close-knit family and the hub of our family was my father and our ranch.

''Even though my brother Jack and my sister Cary and I do not live there anymore, we all go home, along with the grandchildren, to help with the seasonal work. My daughter and I take as much time off in the summer as we can so that we can work at the summer cow camp in Copper Basin moving the cattle. My mother puts on a lot of church and community picnics and barbecues down by the swimming hole. Every June our family enters the local parade with a float representing our ranch, and all our other ranchers and their families in the valley do the same. Last year, the theme for the parade was the Mackays Heritage Ranching Mining and Logging.

''My father's death was the most devastating event any of us had ever gone through. The second most devastating event was sitting down with our estate attorney after my father's death. And I will never forget what the attorney said. 'There is no way you can keep this ranch. Absolutely no way.' Still in shock from the accident, I asked, 'How can this be? It's our ranch. We own the land. We've paid the taxes. We have no debt. We just lost our father, and now we're going to lose the ranch, the very thing which was the centrifugal force of keeping our family together along with our father?' our attorney proceeded to pencil out the death taxes that would be due after my mother's death, and we all sat back in total shock. It had taken my grandfather and my father their entire lifetimes to build up this ranch.''

Let me repeat that. ''It had taken my grandfather and my father their entire lifetime to build up this ranch, and now we cannot continue on, and the grandchildren cannot enjoy the land and the rich life-style.'' Now, not rich in monetary terms, but rich in lifestyle, of going out and working hard in the fields. They do not get to have that any more. It provided a rich heritage. Rich, again meaning the character, the heritage that was there that is now going to be taken by the Government on taxes that have already been paid on this property.

''It has been three and a half years on my father's death, and we still don't know what we're going to do. We only know we're not going to be able to keep the ranch unless something can be done with the estate tax now. The estate tax on our family ranching assets is going to be estimated at $3.3 million. Without the land being paid for and tight operating costs, we will not be able to make money from the business. To spread that tax over 14 years at the 4 percent interest is of absolutely no value to us.''

In other words, what she is saying, my colleagues, is do not come to us out in small-town America and our families in ranching operations and tell us that we are being done a great big favor because the Government is going to allow us to finance the death tax over a period of 14 years.

''All this means is that we're going to have to pay an amount of money which is virtually impossible. In order to try to buy a life insurance policy, we're going to have to sell one of the spring ranches now, and that might allow us to pay off one-third of the death tax and avoid a fire sale.''

So what this family is saying is that they will sell part of the ranch now. They are going to sell part of the ranch, a third of the ranch right now, and by doing that what they hope to do is to be able to pay the Government enough money upon the death of their mother that they do not have to go through a fire sale on the rest of the ranch. They are still going to have to sell the rest of the ranch; but if they sell a third of it right now, then they do not have to go to a quick sale on the remaining two-thirds.

''The same scenario is happening to many of our ranchers in the valley. Eighty percent of the ranches have been owned by the same families one, two, and three generations.

''The value of the land has risen dramatically in the last 5 years. All of these ranchers live on very modest incomes and most of them can barely educate their children. I am certain that none of them will be able to pay this tax. The town is almost solely supported by the ranchers who buy feed, gas, food and clothing. The community will not be able to survive without them.

''What is happening is that these ranches are being bought by wealthy absentee owners who do not run cattle and who fly in once or twice a year to enjoy the amenities of the ranch. This has already happened to two neighboring ranches, both of those owners, both second generation ranchers were killed, unfortunately, in accidents. Their families could not pay the death tax and had to sell the ranches to wealthy Southern Californians.

''I have heard it said that the death tax exists to redistribute wealth; to take from the rich, presumably to benefit others less fortunate. Let me tell you, from where I stand now, that is a tax that accomplishes exactly the opposite. For my family, the tax means we will not be able to continue running the ranch that has been our heritage for over 60 years.

''The Congress says it is a pro-family Congress. However, I know from my personal experience that the death tax is antifamily. The death tax will force us to sell our ranch to a wealthy absentee owner who is unlikely to run cattle or keep the workers employed or contribute to the community. Surely if Congress does not provide relief from the death tax, many other families across this country will suffer a similar fate. Ultimately, I wonder whether towns like our small town, as we know it today, will continue to exist.

''I urge you to ask yourself why does this death tax exist? Is it worth the great harm it has caused to my family and to many others like us? If it is not worth the harm, then the death tax shouldn't exist, and I hope you will do everything in your power to eliminate the death tax.''

What more can I say? This is a letter sent to our office. This is from their heart. This is not something some big fancy lobbying organization in Washington, D.C., sent to me. It was not sent to me by the Rockefellers or the Kennedys or the Mellons or the Gateses, or any of those kind of people. This letter was sent to our office by a small family not to make money on the ranching, simply trying to pass their ranch from one generation to the other, to pass the heritage from one generation to the other; simply to keep the money for their ranching and their ranching community alive in their small community.

And by the way, for those of my colleagues who voted no on the death tax,

voted to keep it in place, in fact supported the President's budget to increase the death tax, if only they could take the time to really, really see, to go out and visit this family, my guess would be that those same individuals, those who voted to support the death tax, who stand in favor of the death tax, and who want to increase the death tax, after having taken the time to go out and visit with this family, I think they would come back a new man or a new woman; and I think they would be prepared to get rid of that death tax.

□ 1930

Now let me go on to the next subject because it is somewhat related.

Once again, here it is the Federal Government, the taxing entity of the United States, has decided that not only death is a taxable event, it is the Government that decided some time ago, and let us call it as it is, Democrats, it happened when you had it here for 40 years, it was determined during that period of time that marriage, being married, should be a taxable event.

Now, let me say at the onset, we had a vote on this, we had a couple votes on this; and I can say with a great deal of confidence with the Democrats here on the House floor, that 48 of the Democrats voted to get rid of that marriage tax. In fact, the President of the United States, standing right here in his State of the Union address, said we needed to get rid of the estate tax.

I have got an editorial here from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, an excellent newspaper, western Colorado, Grand Junction, Colorado. It was just last January that President Clinton, as a part of his State of the Union address urged Congress, urged all of us sitting down here listening to the speech being made right there, urged us to enact legislation to end the so-called marriage penalty.

What a reversal. Now the President's policy is he is going to veto it. And some people on this floor support that position.

I hope you have enough guts when you go back to your district to stand up to your constituents and look them in the eye and try and justify that. Number one, tell them how you voted, that you voted to support the marriage penalty, and do not give them some flimsy, run-around excuse for it. It was a straight up-or-down vote, do you support taxing marriages or do you not support it? If you support the marriage penalty, then you voted no on this bill to get rid of it and you ought to stand up.

I hope your constituents understand that it is a straight up-or-down vote. There were no side issues involved here. What we are sending down to the administration, to the President and the Vice President, we hope they sign but they have already promised to veto despite the fact the President stood up here and gave his State of the Union address and said we ought to get rid of the marriage penalty. So you talk about it on one end and then you end it on the other with a veto.

How can a country who is proud of the family foundation, who boasts to the rest of the world that our country has become the strongest country in the history of the world, in a large part due to the fact that we have strong families, that we encourage marriage, how can we look at other countries and say, by the way, this is the country in the world where we penalize you if you are married, we tax you, it is a taxable event, come to the United States and get married and it is taxable, the event is a taxable event, just like the death? How do you justify any one of those?

Both of those taxes. The marriage penalty, do you think that encourages our young people, the hope of our country, do you think it encourages them to get married? And how much of that money, by the way, for those of you who support taxing marriage, how much of that money do you think could have gone into these young people's education?

There are a lot of young married couples out there that like to have that extra $1,400 to pay for their college tuition or to go out and further their education. And some of you stand up and talk about how you advocate and you are pro-education, and by the way I have never found anybody that is anti-education, but you stand up and advocate how you are pro-education, but then you turn around and vote for a tax, a marriage penalty, that takes $1,400 away primarily from these young couples who are the very ones who need that money to further their education.

How can you justify it? How can you look at your constituents and say that you can justify taxing a married couple simply because of the fact that they are married?

And again, my colleagues, when you go out there into your districts, do not give any cock-and-bull story about why getting rid of the marriage penalty would cause this or cause that or as I heard the news report Saturday that the President said getting rid of the death tax and getting rid of the marriage penalty would put the surplus at risk.

What a bunch of hogwash. It is not going to put the surplus at risk, not at all. The question here is fundamental fairness. That is what you ought to look at. Is it fundamentally fair to consider death a taxable event? Is it fundamentally fair to go out there and consider a marriage a taxable event?

This Government is not in such dire straits that it has to go out and tax its own citizens when they die. This Government is not in such dire straits that it needs to go out to our young people and show up with a wedding gift of a tax bill.

And even if this country was in dire straits economically, can you justify the marriage penalty, can you justify the death tax based on that event? Of course you cannot. Of course you cannot.

Mr. Speaker, let me move from the death tax and from the marriage penalty. But before I do, let me point out one thing. Remember, the President stood up here, as I said earlier in my comments, he stood up here when he gave the State of the Union address and urged all of us to get rid of the marriage penalty. Let us see if he stands by his words this week and signs the bill, or let us see if he turns around and vetoes the bill.

The last I heard coming from the White House was they wanted to do a little bargain, a little tit for tat. Hey, give us this program and maybe we will give you the marriage tax penalty.

Quit the horse play. The marriage penalty is not justified. To many of us on the floor, we make a hundred and some thousand bucks a year. The marriage penalty, you can absorb it. Maybe it is not a big bother to you. But you ought to take a look at our kids. My kids are that age where they are of the age where they are getting married and things like that. Ask yourself, look at what kind of punishment it is on them.

So we will see this week. We will see if the President sticks by his words, his policy. His policy was to get rid of the marriage penalty.

Oh, how interesting it is a couple 3 or 4 months before a national election. Now we are going to see him veto it. I hope we all keep that in mind when we go back to our constituents and say somehow Washington, D.C. is able to justify death and marriage, both of them, as taxable events.

Well, while we are on the discussion that involves our younger generation, a generation, by the way, that has so many things going on for it. My gosh, the young people that come into my office. The excitement they have, the energy. As many of my colleagues know, they run circles around us they are so bright. They are capable, the computer world, that generation that follows us and the generation that follows that generation, these generations have a whole lot more going for them than they do going against them.

And we, I think, my colleagues serving on this House floor, I think we have a fiduciary responsibility to that generation and the generation behind that generation and all future generations to get the programs that this Government has in place in as good a shape as we can get them in.

Frankly, that is what I like about the Governor of Texas', George W. Bush, position on education. Every time I have talked to him, and I have talked to him on a number of different occasions, I cannot remember one conversation of any length that I have had with George W. Bush where he has not brought up education.

Why? Because the best thing we can do for this next generation is to make sure that we have an education system that works, that we have a health care system that works. And there is one

other factor out there that we have got to do some work on. We have got to make sure that our Social Security system is in place.

And you know what? In those conversations that I have had with George W. Bush, that was in the conversation: Healthcare, education, and Social Security.

Now, look, our Social Security system from a cash basis, that means money in the bank today, is not in trouble. Social Security is not in trouble today on a cash basis, but on an actuarial basis.

In other words, Social Security today has this amount of money required for claims and it has this amount of money in the bank. But what happens over the next 30 years is these lines begin to intersect. So on a cash basis today, we have money in the bank, there is a surplus in there. It is a surplus.

But what happens is that as this begins to go out is that when you reach this point, you owe all of this money, and this actually, and then all of a sudden it goes up like that. And not even a slight increase. It is almost like a rocket. It goes up just like that.

Those are our obligations. And these obligations right here are not obligations 30 years out. It is actually 30 years out or so before they collect them. But the obligations had been incurred today. In other words, we owe the money today.

So when we look at the Social Security system, we should not look at the money we have in the bank today. That is one factor to look at the money we have in the bank today. But we also need to look at what obligations we have.

It is kind of like deciding when you get your paycheck on the first of the month, I am a rich person, you know, I have got a $2,000 or I have got a $1,500 paycheck here. Well, you cannot just look at how much you have in your hand. You have got to take a look at how much you owe. And when you take a look at Social Security on an actuarial basis, it is bankrupt. Today it is not. But 30 years from now when we pay what we owe, it is bankrupt.

Now, what is giving me some confidence about the debate that we have had on Social Security, what gave me the confidence when I talked to George W. Bush was the fact that we are for the first time in a long time looking out ahead. We do have some time if we really take it seriously.

What I liked about the Bush approach was that they are willing to take some risks. We have got to take some risks. We cannot let the Social Security system stay on status quo. If we stay with status quo, we are all going to be happy until that point right there. That is what status quo buys us. It buys us a plane in the air without a propeller at that point right there.

Now is the time to start thinking about how do we get this line, how do we adapt for this so that we come close so we still bring those two lines together but we do not have the obligations way exceeding it. What do we do?

Well, I think in order to figure out what we do, we have got to figure out historically what was gone wrong with the fund, where have we run into problems with Social Security.

Well, there are a couple key factors to keep in mind. Number one, when Social Security was first created, when Social Security first came about, there were 43 workers for every retired person. So for every one person that was retiring on Social Security we had 43 workers supporting the system. That is when Social Security first came into place.

Today do you know what that number is? Today we have three workers for every person, three workers in our working system for every person on retirement.

□ 1945

That is a dramatic difference and that is a significant problem that has led us to the actuarial problem we have in Social Security.

What is the other problem that we have in Social Security? That one is actually pretty, hey, good news. It is our health care system in this country. When Social Security was first created, a man could expect to live to be 61 years old. But throughout time because of the advancements of Social Security, and this is good news for us, but because of the advances in Social Security, that man now can expect to live to be 73 years old. For the female, those numbers were 65, and now they are somewhere around 78 approximately. Those are good numbers.

But the problem is that we now have more people on the Social Security system, we have less workers supporting the Social Security system, and we have people living to a longer age. The couple that is drawing from Social Security today draws out about $118,000 more than they put into the system because of these factors. They are taking out $118,000 more than they put in. A system cannot operate like that. We have got to make some adjustments.

What kind of adjustments do we make and who is going to be impacted? The plan that Governor Bush of Texas has put out and the plan that I am advocating tonight, not because of the fact that I am absolutely convinced that there is only one plan out there, but it is because of the fact that I have looked at a number of different options; and I think the one that is the best is one that has some experience, and the one that has some experience is the one that the governor of Texas has proposed we adopt in these halls of Congress.

Why does it have some experience? Because we Members of Congress have our own retirement plan. We are on Social Security, by the way. But we have our own retirement plan here in Congress which allows us choice, not allowed under Social Security.

So what we need to do when we look at Social Security is, first of all, any kind of proposal, and the proposal put out by the governor of the State of Texas has one fundamental rule at the very beginning and that is, those who are currently on Social Security, so our current recipients, face no risk. Anybody on Social Security today does not have any threat to their Social Security retirement funds that they are receiving. That is fundamental and they are not at risk in any sense. So during this political season, do not let your constituents be hoodwinked into thinking that their Social Security pension that they are drawing today is at risk. It is not. What we are talking about is what can we do for the future generation? What can we do for my children and my children's children to help assure that when they get there, Social Security will be alive and well?

What the proposal is that has been put forth by the governor, I guess really the best way to do it, let me explain what happens if you are a Member of Congress or if you are a government employee, so it is not just Congress, it is Federal employees, so there are over 2 million Federal employees in this country, over 2 million. Here is the plan they have in effect. First of all, they do pay Social Security.

But here is the Government plan, the U.S. Government plan for its own people. It is called the Thrift Savings Plan. It really works in two ways. It has two sections to it. The first section we will call section A pulls an amount of money out of your paycheck every month and you have no say-so about where that is invested. It is the safety net. It is your safety net. So this amount of money is pulled out. You have no say-so; but as a result of that, after, say, so many years of service and a certain age, you are guaranteed a certain retirement check every month. No risk, not much return, but no risk.

Now, by the way, if you want to consider return, figure out that Social Security, if you were born, for example, in 1960, so that would make you 41 today, 40 years old, if you were 40 years old, your return on the current system, if we do not do anything with Social Security, your return is less than 1 percent. 1 percent. Less than 1 percent. That is what you are making on Social Security. We can do better. And the Government knows it can do better because it does it on its own program.

So the first part of the Government retirement program which covers all government employees has this pullout; it is an automatic pullout out of your check. It is for your retirement. I forget exactly what mine is every month. I have no choice. That is the safety net. The second section is what we call, we will just call it section B. That is not the formal name; but for our discussion tonight, B. What that allows you to do is it is optional. You

do not have to do it. If you as a government employee do not want to participate in the second portion, you do not have to. But if you want to, you can designate, not all your retirement money but you can designate up to 10 percent. You can designate up to 10 percent of your salary every month to go into that retirement section.

What that allows you to do is it gives you three choices. The three choices really are an opportunity for you as an individual to invest your retirement money, to help plan for your own retirement. It gives you choice. Social Security today gives you no choice. It mandates you live with the 1 percent return. It mandates that. But this program here, the Government program for its own employees allows you, if you want to, totally optional, to participate in this program of choice.

What does it do? You contribute up to 10 percent of your check; then I think the Government matches the first 5 percent, then you get to make a choice. You can have that money invested in government savings where it is insured, it is guaranteed and, of course, when you have a guaranteed return with minimal risk, you are going to have a low return. The history of that shows that pays 3, 4 percent a year. The second option you have is you can go into the bond market. The third option you can go into is your highest risk, which offers your highest returns, but again has its highest risk and it is the stock market. But even if you took the stock market choice and you lost everything, you still had the safety net up here. That is how the Government program for 2.5 million people works.

By the way, I want you to know that the strongest opposition to George Bush's plan to bring out this Social Security, to help it for this next generation, the strongest opposition, of course, comes from the administration. But I can tell you that the Vice President voted for this government program many years ago when he was in Congress. So what is good enough for the goose ought to be good enough for the gander. If it is good enough for government employees, why is it not good enough for the citizens of America who want to participate in Social Security?

What the administration has advocated is to take the status quo. Look, we have got 30 years before this next generation gets up there and is going to make a call on the bank. So let's just ride the status quo, or let's have another committee, to study another committee for another committee study. That is not good enough. We have got to take some risk.

Some of you in here, you do not like risk; and I understand that. But I want you to know that the people who are currently on Social Security or are close to, they face no risk. We are not impairing their ability to draw down on Social Security the benefits that they are entitled to. But those of you who want to sit around and do not want to take risk, you better be prepared for this next generation to explain to them why frankly you sat on your duff and did not do anything to save this system.

We have got to have some leadership in Social Security. Somebody has got to take the ship out into the storm. The easiest thing to do is to dock your ship in the harbor and get out of it and get onto the land. But somebody has got to get through to the other side. That is exactly why I was pleased when I saw and sat down, was able actually to discuss only briefly, but discuss the governor of Texas' plan and a plan that most of us on the Republican side and I think frankly a lot of Democrats would support.

This is what the plan does. First of all, it is optional. You are not going to be required to do this, to participate in the choice aspect. Second of all, it has a safety net, so no matter what you want to do, there is going to be the majority of the money taken out of your paycheck for Social Security. The majority of it will be put into an account that you do not have any say over it. In other words, we do not want you losing that. We want to have a safety net, because not everybody is going to make money. Certainly on an average over a period of time, you are going to make a lot better than 1 percent, but some people may make bad decisions. It has been known to happen. Some people make bad decisions. We do not want 30 years out from now somebody saying, Look, I made bad decisions. I by choice invested all my money in really high-risk stuff and I lost. I thought I was going to win. I lost. Even for that person, we want to have at least a minimal safety net. That is what we do right here.

The second part is for those of you who want to under the Social Security system, just like the government thrift savings program, you are going to be allowed to take 2 percent of the money taken out for Social Security and you get to direct it, you get to choose how that money will be invested. We would run that program. The proposal for that program, to revise Social Security, so that this next generation, that our young people have something that they know is rock solid. What this allows you to do is to do the same as 2.5 million other government employees get to do, and, that is, with that 2 percent, you could invest it in a low risk. Low risk, of course, means low return. Or you could invest it in moderate risk, which means possibility of a moderate return. Or you can invest it in high risk, which means the possibility of high return. Of course high risk means that. High risk. You could lose it all. Moderate, you could lose it. This lower one, the first one, you would be guaranteed a return on your savings.

Now, what is wrong with that? Why is the administration opposing it? We, by the way, have a lot of Democrats, obviously from my comments I am a Republican, but we have a lot of Democrats who say this is a good idea. When you get beyond the Potomac out here, when you get out into the rest of America, you find out there are a lot of people out there that are not as partisan as you think. A lot of people out there would join together and say, Look, we have got to do something with Social Security.

I think most people in America, especially the younger generation, by the way, who are investing the maximum amount of money right now with the lowest possibility of return because of the pulling out of the funds, I think you would find that younger generation saying, hey, something has got to happen with the management. We need to take some different course with Social Security, because frankly, the young people are saying, we are paying into this system, why should we not be entitled to expect some kind of return out of the system?

Outside of Washington, D.C., people want Social Security to work. People do not want Washington, D.C., to bog down Social Security. They want a program that will move forward. Now, I know that the governor of Texas has come under some criticism because he has been bold enough to go out and say we have got to take this ship on a different course. And sure it looks like there is a storm ahead, but the only way we are going to get to the other side is we have got to sail. And somebody has got to have enough courage to stand up there and say, Look, let's try moving the ship. Not dramatically, not radically. We are not going through the eye of the storm to get torn up.

Under proper guidance and leadership, we can take this ship on a safe voyage. And when we get to the other end, this generation behind us and two generations behind us and the other generations that follow will have a Social Security system that the first thing you talk about is not how quickly it is going to fail. The first thing you should be able to talk about on Social Security is, it is a system that works. It is a system that works. And it allows you to have the choice.

Think about it. If you are confident today and for those of you who are standing and are opposed to any kind of change in Social Security, for those of you who are supporting the administration's policy, go out beyond the Potomac River and ask constituents of yours out there, If you've got a million dollars and you want to invest it, would you send it to the Social Security Administration or would you send it to the United States Congress to invest it on your behalf? Of course they are not going to say that. They have confidence that they can invest it better than we can back here in Washington, D.C.

Considering that the return for somebody born in 1960 is going to be less than 1 percent on their dollar in Social Security, I think they are right. I have got a lot more confidence in this younger generation than some of you

might. I think they know, and I think they can wisely make decisions with a very small percentage of those Social Security payments. Remember, the people that are in the Social Security system, we are not allowing them to invest everything. We are not going to allow somebody to go in there and say, I want to take all my Social Security and put 100 percent of it in the stock market. We are taking 98 percent of it and saying, You don't have any choice on it. That is your safety net.

□ 2000

That no matter how bad a decision you make, you still are going to have a payment available to you for those of us born in 1960 in another 15 years or 20 years, but we are going to do something different. Some would call it a dramatic course of action.

I do not think it is dramatic in its results. I think it is dramatic, and it is finally about time that somebody stood at the helm of the ship and said let us change the course.

What we are doing is we are allowing them to take just a small percentage, that younger generation, and let us give them a little confidence for their capabilities of making decisions and saying to the younger generation we are going to allow you a choice. You get to help in that investment; it is, after all, your dollar. Many people in Washington D.C., get the idea that it is the money of the Government back here.

It is not the money of the Government. It is the money of the people, and they have sent it to us on a trustee basis, and I do not think it is so wrong to ask them to help join us in the decisions that should be made on the investments of their dollars. And that is what that Social Security plan calls for. That is why I hope when we reconvene with a new President in January of next year that on that agenda we have three items of which I consider very important: one, an opportunity to take Social Security and allow the people more input and allow the younger people of this country an opportunity to voice their decision and help make decisions on their own personal investments in that Social Security system. We can save Social Security. It does not need to be bankrupt in 30 years.

The second thing I hope we see when we have a new President in January, because I am afraid unfortunately that the President we have today is going to veto it, and that is elimination of the penalty for being married. As I said earlier, how can we possibly justify marriage as a taxable event? This President does. It is his policy.

The third thing I hope we have when we have a new President in January is the elimination of that death tax. Like with the marriage tax, how can we justify taxing somebody simply based on the fact that they died? What kind of government is this? Is this a socialistic type of government?

What does it do to the local communities? What does it do to the family farms and ranches? What does it do to the small contractor. Remember, a backhoe, a dump truck, and a bulldozer and you are in that bracket.

Mr. Speaker, I am in hopes in January we have a President that will do those three things: guide us with Social Security, give us some bold strong leadership, as the governor of Texas has suggested; number two, get rid of that marriage penalty. Let us do what we say we are doing. Let us really encourage our young people to get married. Let us encourage our young people to have a foundation of family without worrying about being taxed for it. Third of all, let us give the next generation on the family farm or the family ranch and the local farming community, let us give them an opportunity to keep those resources in the family, in the community, instead of penalizing the family, penalizing the community, in spending that money right out of there straight to Washington, D.C.

I am confident, colleagues, that we have a very positive future ahead of this country. I could not be more excited about the future of the United States of America. I could not be more excited about our young people, and that is why we have to keep education as a priority; that is why we have to look at these factors that I have discussed tonight.

We cannot continue on a positive course and improve it if we do not put a lot of effort into it. It is not going to come free, and it is not going to happen when we penalize marriage. It is not going to happen when we penalize death, when we call it a taxable event. It is not going to happen when we look at this next generation and say to them, well, to Social Security, here is your bankrupt system that you helped pay for. We can change all of that.

I hope my colleagues join with myself and our new President in January to make those kinds of changes, because that is what this country is all about, making a difference. And we, colleagues, can make that difference, and the people of our country deserve it.

INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I trust I will be joined by some of my colleagues before the evening is over with to talk on the issue, but as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) was talking about a moment ago on Social Security, I would remind our colleagues and those who are listening this evening that Social Security has been with us now since the 1930s.

There have been those who have talked about its demise ever since and some who have tried to make sure it was not here, but I would remind them as we talk about all of the gimmicks, anytime we take money out of the system, if it is 2 percent or 3 percent or whatever the percent we take out, that is less money we have for those who are drawing. It means that we will meet that date of finality he was talking about, and it will run out of money sooner.

Mr. Speaker, I was home this weekend and had an occasion to see a movie. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) talked about the turmoil and all the tough times as if it were a turmoil, and that reminds me of a movie I saw called the Perfect Storm. When these fishermen went out to catch their final catch and they made the fatal decision to head into a storm without really having all the facts, if you have not seen the movie, the Perfect Storm, I will not give away all the plot.

I would say to my colleagues, just like dealing with Social Security, anything else, we better know where we are headed because the Perfect Storm was a total disaster, one of the worst in our history.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk about investing in our future. As the former chief of my State schools, I want to talk this evening about a critical issue facing our Nation, and that is the education of our children, and the buildings in which we put them as well, because it is about investing these dollars that Congress is talking about now that we have or we may have over the next 10 years.

Before we get too far along this road of making some decisions on tax relief, at a time when we better be investing in the next generation, there is no question that we can have targeted relief; but we better be making the investment in our young people.

Mr. Speaker, all too often in this town we hear politicians making speeches about how the schools are supposedly no good, how they ought to have competition, how it is really in the private sector that things are really happening, it is really not in the public sector.

I am here this evening to tell my colleagues that I am one of those who will defend the public schools as the best opportunity for excellence in education for all children, and we need to stand up and be counted and spread the good news about those quiet successes, those stories that are happening in communities all across this country that are not being told.

Too many times we like to talk about problems. It is easy to talk about negatives; people will listen. This morning I had the opportunity in my district to visit one of those success stories, and I would say that any Member serving in this body can find a success story in their district any time they want to find it. We can always find the glass half empty. The question is, do we really want to find it half full?

Education, and public education is that great leveler in society that helps people have an opportunity to move up. As I said, I visited one of those successes this morning; and I am honored to have an opportunity this evening to brag a little bit on those students, and those teachers, on those teachers' assistants, an outstanding principal, and an awful lot of people that contributed to the success of a bunch of children.

This morning I visited Harnett Primary School in Dunn, North Carolina, to participate in a teacher appreciation day that was put on by the local PTO and business people in that community.

I can say I was amazed at the success that principal Linda Turlington had with her wonderful faculty staff and students, but I probably would not be totally honest, because I know them. They are outstanding people and they work hard; but I think if they were here this evening talking with my colleagues and others, what they would say is they represent millions of teachers and staff who go in to an awful lot of nice schools, some not so nice schools, and some buildings that children ought not to even be in, because of the condition they are in; and they work hard every day and go home in the evenings and prepare for the next day to help children meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Let me talk for just a minute, if I may, about Principal Linda Turlington and about her wonderful staff and her faculty and all of those students. Just 4 years ago, 4 short years ago, they had a performance that they were not happy with. Only about 50 percent of her students, or their students, were performing at what is called grade level on the North Carolina end-of-grade test. They decided that was not acceptable; they could do a better job with their children if they worked together.

And I spoke to them about that this morning, because it is fine to have one outstanding teacher, one outstanding principal; but it is what we have to have as everyone working together as a team to make a difference. We can have a great athletic team, and we can have a superstar; but if all we have is one superstar, they may make a difference in some games. They will not win all the games. We have to be a team.

So they started to work. They started identifying students. They started making sure their curriculum was rich, it was strong, that they were helping every children achieve. So last year they went from 50 percent to raise that level or the year before last, last year, almost 80 percent of their children, 77.4 percent, had reached grade level.

This morning they were saying that is not good enough. They are working for all their children; that is real progress. It is the kind of improvement we ought to go about making in every community, in every county, in every State across the country; and we can do it. But we can only do it when we talk about the successes and help people achieve the best they can achieve.

We cannot do it when we always talk about all the problems that run people down. This did not happen by accident. It took dedication, hard work on the part of teachers implementing the best practices they could get, not only in their school, but in their system, pulling down the best ideas all across the State and across the country.

They practiced the things they learned, and they shared it on a collective basis; and they brought in some of the best minds to work with them. Everyone was committed and focused on achieving and sharing the goals of one thing, to improve student achievement.

Now, did this school achieve all of these great successes because they had the best students in the county system? The answer is no. They had outstanding students. Every school does. Remember, this is the same school that only had 50 percent 4 years before. What was different? It was certainly attitude on the part of the teachers, and everyone on that staff. And it was also the attitude on the part of parents and students who said we can do better, and we will do better.

I am so proud that this school has achieved the exemplary status for the people in Dunn and for Harnett Primary. But I say to my colleagues this evening that rather than bad-mouthing our public schools, like many politicians in this town do, Congress needs to support the sincere effort under way on the ground.

As we work to improve our schools for all of our children, every child, whether they come from a background of parents who have resources to help them, or whether they come from parents who want their children to do well but just do not have those resources, every parent in the 8 years I served as superintendent, I never met a parent who did not want or desire for their children to have a good education.

□ 2015

They may not have known how to get there, but they wanted it for them.

Mr. Speaker, we have that challenge today, we have it next week, and we will have it next year. Certainly Congress has no business, in my opinion, trying to be a national school board. That is not our charge nor our responsibility. It is a state-funded responsibility and local delivery of education, but there is no reason that Congress should not, cannot, and ought not to put resources in to help those young people in those schools and areas where they are not achieving, where they should be achieving.

We made that decision years ago, and the Federal funding for education has slipped since the 1960s. We went through a period where we saw it drop, and now it is coming back, and we need to continue that push. It is so important.

The 21st century, in my opinion, will be a century that will belong to the educated. Let me repeat that again: The 21st century will belong to the educated. There was a time when you could get a job if you dropped out of school. Those days are fast disappearing.

We spend a lot of time in this town arguing back and forth about appropriations, budgets, et cetera, et cetera, but what gets lost too often in all the sound and fury of legislative debate is the central meaning of the choices we make.

The choices we make are about our priorities. They also say something about our character, what we care about. Where we put our resources, or our money, if you please, tells people what is important to us. If you go into a town and you see a nice school building where the parents and the community are invested and involved in, it says education is important in that town. I happen to believe if you go into a town with a rundown building, children recognize very quickly, that is not the most important priority on the part of the people in that town. If the businesses are in order, it says that business is important. I think you can have a partnership of all. The budget and spending choices we make here define what our priorities are. As I said earlier, they truly express our values.

I would say to you that many of my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus and I have been working all year to try to give greater priority to education in this budget process. Why education? As I said earlier, because education is the key to the future for every child, every child, no matter what their ethnic or economic background may happen to be. You deny a child an educational opportunity and you have denied a future family an opportunity to prepare and invest in the next generation. It is as simple as that.

Certainly we value education, and we value it because we know that lifetime learning is the key to the American dream and today it is that ultimate ticket to the middle class. Everyone wants to get there. Whether a child is born into poverty today, if they get an education, they can be in the middle class tomorrow. But if we deny them an educational opportunity, they are relegated to poverty and so are their future children.

We talk about the global economy and America's international competitiveness. Certainly we are in a global economy. What happens on the other side of the world, through telecommunications we know about it now almost instantaneously. But it also means that what happens on the other side of the globe economically impacts us, and we are going to have to deal with them educationally, and our ability to have a knowledge-based job economy is important.

That does not mean agriculture will not be important in the future. Certainly it will be. It will continue to be. I grew up on a farm in my home State. As I tell my colleagues from time to

time, I grew up on what we call a small family farm. I knew what it was to get up at 3 o'clock in the morning and take out tobacco and prime tobacco all day.

But those jobs have changed. Those small farms are much larger today when we talk about family farms. Where I grew up on a 50–75 acre farm, now when you talk about a farm, the farmer is talking about hundreds of acres. It has changed. Technologically it has changed. The equipment you use is different.

It means that even the farmers have to be better educated to compete today. They have to know financing, they have to have computers. Their equipment is driven technologically. The combines, the tractors, all of those are the same thing, just like the factories, are computer driven. That is why children need to have technology in the classroom and teachers need to have it so they can teach it and integrate it in the curriculum.

So in this new economy of this information age, what people can earn will certainly depend on what they have learned. We see that each and every day. We see more young people today becoming millionaires on the dot-com, but, in the end, we have to make something. They are speeding up the process.

It comes back again to what I started talking about, Mr. Speaker. It is about education. It is about access so everyone has a chance at this table. I used to tell folks when I was superintendent, this thing we call public education in America is one of the great opportunities in the world. It is one of the few places in the world that I know of that every child, no matter what their ethnic or economic background may happen to be, they can step up to the great smorgasbord, and, if they are willing to work and learn, they can go as far as their ability will carry them.

We have opened that door of opportunity. We ought to keep it open, and we need to swing it open even wider, right on beyond high school, because today just having 12 years or 13 years is just not adequate. We are going to need 2 and even 4 or more years beyond high school as we move into this 21st century.

So we have been trying here in Congress to get this Congress to give higher priority to strengthen our neighborhood schools and demonstrate how much we value education for our children. Yes, it takes resources, yes, that is money. When you have children who have special needs, they will be contributing members of society if we give them an opportunity to get an education. Yes, those children who have been deprived early will do better if we open the doors and give them pre-kindergarten and special care early on. They will be contributing members and they can make a difference in society and be good students in school. But a child who starts school behind, I am here to tell you, will have a tough time, and many of them may never catch up. That is why Head Start is important for every child who needs it. There are those who would tell you, well, we cannot do it. We cannot afford it. Can we afford not to? Can we afford to have losers? I don't think so.

I think we are a big enough society, we are a big enough country, we have the resources to do all those things if we do it. But, unfortunately, the House Republican leadership has said that we need a lot of other things first. I happen to believe that we need targeted tax cuts. But everything I read lately tells me that what we decided, last year we had almost $800 billion. This time we are talking about doing it in pieces so we will have more and we want to starve them so they will not have the resources.

I grew up on a farm and one of the things I never forgot that my dad told me, he said, ''Son, don't feed the seed corn. Use your best corn to replant it so next year you can have a good harvest.'' What this majority wants to do is eat the seed corn so that our next generation will not have the opportunities, and that is wrong.

We need to make the kind of educational investments so that we can make our schools world class, so we can have high quality curriculum for every child in every classroom. And, yes, we ought to hold them accountable. We ought to have high standards, because, just as I told you at the outset earlier today, the school in Dunn, North Carolina, Harnett Primary School, is holding their children accountable, holding their parents accountable, holding themselves accountable, setting high standards, and those students are reaching it.

I certainly oppose these misguided priorities. We ought to invest in education, we ought to hold the system accountable, and we ought to get it done.

I am pleased at this time to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt) to discuss more about our priorities in education. He certainly has been a leader in the whole area of education, but he has focused his attention on science education. He is one of the true scientists here in Congress and brings a lot to the table.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from North Carolina, who has been a leader throughout his career on education, and has brought that lifetime of experience here to the House of Representatives.

The number of school children is growing now at a record-setting pace. We are experiencing the echo, the baby-boom echo, where the children of the baby boom are in school. I can tell you in my congressional district, there are some school districts where the number of children in kindergarten outnumbers the number in the 12th grade. You do not need to have higher mathematics to understand the implications of that for school construction and the need to provide good classrooms for those teachers and students.

With more than 52 million students in schools today, an all-time high, we are experiencing real crowding in the classrooms. To alleviate the crowding, many of the schools in my district are using the temporary solution of temporary structures, long, narrow, trailer-like facilities that are really unsuited for classrooms. But many schools are forced to use that.

New Jersey communities, as in many other parts of the country, need assistance to help provide the space for the children to learn, for the teachers to teach, and we really cannot postpone that any longer. The civil engineers point to this as the number one infrastructure problem facing the country today. We are investing billions of dollars in new prisons, we are investing billions of dollars in military installations. We should be investing resources in our schools for the sake of our children. It is the seed corn that my colleague speaks of.

I visited more than 80 schools in this term that I have been in Congress, and everywhere I go I hear from parents and teachers and students who feel that there is a role for the Federal Government. We can help.

Together with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, I am working to help these fast-growing school districts, such as he has in his district, such as I have in mine, helping them to afford new and modern schools with what I think is a very attractive concept, tax credit for the holders of school construction bonds, in effect using Federal tax credits so that the school districts are reduced from the pressure of having to pay the interest to raise the capital for the school construction. These interest-free capital bonds will leverage the amount of money available to the school districts. My colleague has been a leader in devising and advocating this really very creative and attractive way of funding school construction.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time on that point, for our colleagues I hope they remember that that is H.R. 996, and, so they do not misunderstand, as the gentleman has indicated, all this does is pay the interest through a tax credit. It would allow the States and local jurisdictions to build the schools, to issue the bonds, but they would pay the principal only and no interest.

It is a way to help the local units not only build the new buildings they need, and we have 53 million students coming into our public schools, the largest number in the history of America, but it will also allow them to renovate and provide for the technology that they so sorely need.

I thank the gentleman for being such a strong proponent of this and being one of the earliest signers on this legislation with me, and trust before this Congress adjourns, that the Republicans will agree to bring this out of the committee, put it on the floor and let us vote it and help the schools.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we certainly should have the opportunity to debate this and vote on it on the floor. It takes away no local authority. The local school authorities will determine what needs to be built and where it needs to be built and when it needs to be built, but I know in my district, many of the towns have difficulty justifying to the taxpayers the large increase in property taxes that would result from the necessary school construction.

Now, this is not a free lunch. Of course, what we are doing in effect is deferring Federal revenue, but in the case of the school districts in central New Jersey it would be a shift away from property taxes, which would allow school districts to get on with the school construction that they know, that we all know, that they need to do.

□ 2030

I think it is a very attractive concept. I only wish, as my colleague says, that we could get this to the floor to be debated as it should be.

The gentleman has been a real leader in advancing this idea and I think this will find favor all across the country.

One other thing I would like to comment on is technology education, science education, and the importance of teachers. I think one of the greatest disservices that we do to students and to teachers is sometimes when people will talk about a born teacher, so and so is a born teacher, there are no more teachers born than there are born lawyers, born doctors, born engineers.

When we talk about it that way, we lose sight of the fact of what hard work it is to be a teacher, and how a teacher must work to keep up with developments in their field and developments in learning, learning how children learn.

So that if we are going to invest in the children of this country and in their education, we must invest in the professional development of teachers.

In most businesses, it is customary to spend several percent, maybe 5 percent, maybe 10 or even 20 percent of salaries in the training and development of the employees. In the field of education, in schools, that is typically 1 percent or less that is invested in the professional development of teachers.

We must recognize that teaching requires continuous learning, continuous development, so that teachers can be the professionals that we want them to be.

In the area of technology, our cars now have more computing power than the Apollo spacecraft had. Computers can send billions of dollars of capital around the world at the touch of a key, and our economy is booming with growth in high-tech industries, and yet a recent survey published by the Department of Education tells us that only 20 percent of teachers feel qualified to use the technology that is now available to them. Not some future technology that is coming but what is available to them today.

That is why I am cosponsoring legislation to help teachers teach technology education. We must do more. In order for our country to continue growing and prospering in this century, we must ensure that our students receive a quality education in science and mathematics and technology. We must do what we can to help the teachers be prepared to teach those subjects.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for those important comments. I particularly agree with the gentleman on the issue of school construction that is so badly needed, not only in those growth areas but in a lot of our urban areas where children are going, as the gentleman said, trailers and substandard buildings that we would not operate a business out of.

I used to go to civic clubs, and still do, and say to the folks, if they really think rundown buildings are good then why do they not invite the next business who comes to town and wants to expand, take them down to the old warehouse front and ask them to put their business in there and just say to them it is the buildings; it does not make that much difference. It is the people that are put in there, and see if they come back and open their factory in their town. They will not come back.

I think the children deserve a quality place to go to school and teachers need a good place to learn.

Mr. HOLT. If I may comment on that point, nationally schools now have an average age of about 45 years. In New Jersey, it is a little closer to 50 years. The average school age in any other business that would be considered obsolete.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLT. There is nothing that should lead us to believe that teaching techniques cannot advance just as business and manufacturing techniques advance.

We have learned a lot in the last 50 years, in the last 100 years, about how children learn. Some of that has implications for how we construct a classroom and how we run a class. We need modern facilities.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Architects are doing that, and I would say to our colleagues who have not been into a school lately, go into one. Talk with the teachers, spend some time other than visiting. They will find out that just because the buildings still may be square or are have corners, it is an entirely different place on the inside.

I happen to agree with the gentleman on this issue of technology. As the gentleman indicated earlier, as a former superintendent of my State schools I also know firsthand of a lot of amazing stories and a lot of good things happening in our schools.

For example, contrary to all the badmouthing our schools tend to get from partisan politicians, student mathematics achievement has improved. We need to do better. Between 1982 and 1996, students improved their achievement in mathematics as measured by the, as the gentleman well knows, National Assessment of Education Progress, one of the most respected testing services we have.

Students in my home State, as an example, have made gains that are three times the national average of gains on NAEP. Some of the greatest gains have come from our minority students, which is crucial because we do not have a single child to waste in the 21st Century. We must bring everyone along. Today when unemployment is low and we are searching for workers, we need everyone.

We have other good news as well, let me just say to the gentleman. Student science achievement is improving. The gentleman has been a leader in trying to make sure we get more dollars out there to improve it even more. SAT scores have increased every year since 1990. ACT scores are up. These are things people do not want to talk about when we are doing good things.

Students are taking more AP courses. As the gentleman well knows, AP is the advance placement courses. In high school, one takes college level courses that they can use their first year in college.

School violence is coming down, and that is important. Public school teachers are better educated than private school teachers.

Some would want to say that is not true. These are statistics from the Department of Education. I think they happen to be accurate.

More students are going on to higher education. We need even more to go in this 21st Century. More women are going on to graduate and to professional degrees. As I said, we have no one we can leave behind. It is making a difference.

We have a lot more examples, but if America is going to seize the opportunity of this new economy that the gentleman was talking about earlier, Congress must provide national leadership in this vital area of education. We cannot shirk our responsibility because across this country American people are calling for a greater effort in investment in education, not less.

Now the Republican leadership is proposing private school vouchers all over again, the same thing we have heard before. They want to take billions of dollars out of tax money and use it to finance private school vouchers. I happen to believe that is wrong. We do not have enough money in the public schools today. We should not be draining those resources away and leave our children behind to be condemned to a bleak future of failure. That is absolutely wrong, and my colleagues and I who have been working on this special order this evening we do have some ideas about how we can do better things.

Yes, we must invest in a national commitment on education. Yes, we

must hold schools accountable. Yes, we must be accountable to the taxpayers. Yes, we must raise standards and every child must have an opportunity to learn, and we have to put the resources under them so they can get there.

Improving education in this country is about creating a classroom environment where children can learn and teachers can teach. We need to foster greater connection between students, teachers and parents, and the gentleman has worked on that. The gentleman has been a leader in it.

Mr. HOLT. The key is what the gentleman referred to just a moment ago, is every student. That is our national ideal, that we provide an excellent education for all students; not just science education for future scientists; not just smaller class sizes for those who can afford private schools; not just reading for those who are fortunate to have good pre-school access and exposure to books. No; for all children. That is the ideal that we should be upholding in everything we do here in the Congress, is that this general education, which is special to America, is what has made us so successful and what we must at every opportunity talk about and try to ensure in every school district across the country, that we are talking about education for all.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for that. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When some people use the words they talk about students and children, they really are not talking about all children. They do not mean all children. The gentleman does. I do. I trust that is what we are talking about when we talk about public education.

I used to tell folks when I was superintendent, and I still do it as I talk, the difference between public school and any other school, than any other, is that when those yellow school buses show up in the front of that school, they do not ask those children have they had breakfast; they do not ask them if they came from a wealthy household with two parents; they do not ask them anything. They take all comers with all their opportunities, with all their challenges, and those teachers go in those classrooms every single day and work their heart out to make sure that every child does the best they can do.

It is a tough job being a teacher. I have a son who is a fourth grade teacher. It is a tough job. I admire him for it because I have been in and seen some of the challenges they face. My daughter was a high school teacher. She is now going to law school. I guess for whatever reason she wants to go into education law.

One of the best ways that we can improve education is one of the things the gentleman just talked about is providing smaller class sizes that are orderly, disciplined and where every child can get that additional attention that they so badly need. When we talk about private schools, or any other area, we really are talking about personalized attention, smaller class sizes, because when a child has a smaller class size, they can get more individualized attention. That is why this Congress is working with the President trying to get 100,000 new teachers, and we are not talking about block grant so the money can be used for a lot of other things.

I was a superintendent. I know what will happen when block grants are sent. I was at the State level when Congress decided we are going to send a block grant, and the next thing we are going to do we are going to cut that sucker because we decided less can be used in administration; so we will cut it. Then when they cut it, they will come back and say a good enough job was not done with the money we sent so we are just going to cut it out; teachers or staff cannot be hired in block grants.

People tend to want to have a career path if they come into education. They are not looking for a one-year job to move somewhere else, and I do not think Members of this Congress still understand that when teachers are hired, the money ought to be categorized that they can use for that. Children show up in the classroom as kindergartners. The last time I checked, and the gentleman has been a proponent of this, they tend to stay 13 years. They need to be taught for those 13 years.

Mr. HOLT. Smaller class sizes, particularly in the early years, are essential. It is when students learn how to learn. The educational literature is clear on this. Smaller class sizes help students, and the advantage lasts for years and years. In fact, it may last a lifetime.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I agree.

Mr. HOLT. If we could get class sizes down to an average of 18 students in kindergarten through third grade, it would benefit not only those teachers and those students during those years, it would benefit those students when they get to high school.

The literature is clear on this, and that is what the President has been talking about in his effort to get 100,000 new teachers, particularly in the early years, so that we can have an average class size that appears to be optimum at about 18 students. That is what teachers tell me. One does not need to be smaller than that, but they should not be larger than that. It is a worthwhile goal.

As the gentleman knows, we are two years into this process now. We have appropriated funds for 30,000 new teachers around the country, but we still have more to do.

This would be in addition to hiring the teachers necessary to just keep up with retirement and attrition. This would be to actually reduce class sizes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When we talk about the number of teachers we are going to need over the next 4 or 5 years that are retiring and the openings and the challenges this country faces in having teachers in front of those classes who are the best teachers we can get who are certified in their curriculum area and doing the things we need to really raise our standards, that probably is a special order for a whole other day, and I hope we can talk about that because I think it is important as we are looking at 53 million students this year and more coming next year and over the next 10 years we are going to see growth.

□ 2045

It is what we are calling the ''baby boom echo.'' I used to tell folks we are growing so fast in North Carolina, we have low unemployment, a lot of folks moving in. We can always tell because school folks tend to want to project out how many teachers they are going to need, how many schools they are going to need. They can do a pretty good job based on live births; take the births in a community and go 5 years out and they can expect them to be coming to kindergarten. We have a lot of folks moving into our community coming from other places, who have a habit of bringing their children with them. That expands the opportunity, the need for more school buildings.

But I think that we need to provide more support for our teachers, because they do have a very difficult but a critical job that has to be done. Because if we do not have the best people in those classrooms and we do not support them with the resources they need, we do not give them the kind of environment to teach in with the tools to teach our children, we are going to pay a heavy price in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in, my opinion, outside of protecting our borders with our military and our national defense, the second most important thing we have is educating the next generation to be able to inherit the greatest country in the world. Because if we do not do that, we will rue the day that we did not do that.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there is no better investment for the future. The gentleman speaks about the need for more teachers, and the gentleman is right. This is a subject for an entire day's discussion, I think; but let me just point out, as the gentleman knows well, in the next 10 years we will need to hire 2.2 million new teachers just to stay even. Not for smaller class sizes, but just to keep up with the current needs as teachers retire, as teachers, for various reasons, leave the profession. 2.2 million teachers.

We have to make sure that we provide the training. As they enter the profession, that they are provided the mentoring in the early years and that we provide a climate of continuous improvement. That is what we talk about in industry; we should have the same thing in the teaching profession as we have in the medical profession and the legal profession.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New Jersey was speaking, I was thinking as we were going through that what the gentleman is talking about is 2.5 million. That does not include the growth numbers we are going to need for whatever that baby boom echo carries out for years. As we think about education, and the gentleman has been a real leader in this certainly in math and science education, but the gentleman has expanded to all education and I thank him for that, bringing his background to this hall of the people's house.

But we recognize that when we talk about hiring more teachers, even with the 100,000 that we are providing in resources, so that our colleagues understand and those who may be watching this evening, we really are talking about them being hired where they teach. They are not hired in Washington. In my case, when I was in Raleigh as State Superintendent, they were not hired at the State capitals. They were hired in the communities where the people are.

That is why it is important when we talk about categorical money, so that people understand, that is money sent down specifically for teachers. When we send a block grant, that is a money that can be pulled away. That is why we think it is important to send that string for teachers so when they hire an individual, if they hire them to teach, they have a job this year and that money is going to follow next year.

Mr. Speaker, when a person makes a commitment to a career in education, they know they are not going to get rich but they are going to be rich in rewards and responsibilities. My son reminds me that his groceries cost just as much when he gets his paycheck as a teacher as the groceries of the president of the largest bank. So we have to recognize if we are going to keep good teachers in the classroom and continue to attract the quality of people that we need to teach our children, we are going to have to make a decision.

Congress certainly cannot do that. It is a local-level and a State-level decision, but we ought not to be bad mouthing them. We ought to be raising them up and empowering them. And any way we can help, if we can fund 100,000 teachers, certainly we can do that. Can we help with school construction? Yes, we can help with that. Can we help with staff development at the university level? Absolutely, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, rather than talk about these things that I think are irresponsible, and block grants and vouchers, we ought to be talking about how we can help and hold up and encourage.

Young people respond. I remember something in a book I read by Coach John Wooden of UCLA, one of the great basketball coaches of all time in his book entitled, They Call Me Coach. He had several great lines, only one of which I will share this evening. He said: You know, children need role models, not critics.

Mr. Speaker, I believe teachers need encouragement, not criticism from public officials and certainly not from this body, the body that people around this country and around the world look to for leadership from time to time. We ought to be their greatest cheerleaders saying to them, ''We are here to support you and help you. We are going to do what we can to help make your life better.'' And, yes, we are going to send 100,000 teachers and, yes, we can afford to pay that interest to make sure that we have quality classrooms all across this country for children to go to and teachers to teach in.

People recognize in America education all of the sudden again is one of the most important things we have in every community and help our people. As the gentleman from New Jersey indicated earlier, it certainly will not go all the way to correct all the needs, but it will be a start. It will say it is a high priority with those of us in Washington. And, yes, it will have some impact on that local property tax. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I must say that we are fortunate to have the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) in the House of Representatives keeping us focused on these issues. There is no one in this body who has more experience, more knowledge, and more dedication to the providing of excellent education for all of America's children. I thank the gentleman, not just for tonight's special order, but for what the gentleman does day in and day out to keep the House of Representatives focused on the most important investment that we as a country make: The investment in the education of our children.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), and I would say this evening is a very appropriate time as we do this order and talk about education simply because in some communities right now, school is getting ready to open. I went this morning to one where teachers were coming back and over the next several weeks, schools all across America will be opening up. There are some that are year-round schools that are going to be there all year, but there are those who will open up.

Mr. Speaker, 94 Members in this House have signed this bill to build new schools. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) have signed on this bipartisan bill. It enjoys the support of an awful lot of Members of this House, and if we can get it to the floor, I think it will pass. I trust that the Republican leadership will give us a chance to vote on it.

But when school opens for many places across America in the next few weeks, as I have already said, America will have more schoolchildren in our classrooms than at any time in the history of our Republic. More than even during the height of the baby boom. I guess one way to say it is that it is getting better; some might say it is getting worse. I happen to say it is getting better, because we have more children in our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the best financial condition and have the best opportunity in this country that I can remember. As the U.S. Department of Education has documented, this explosive growth will continue for the next decade, and we ought to use this time and use these resources and opportunities we have to invest in our future, and invest in our children.

It is wrong, it is absolutely wrong that we ask children to be in cramped closets, on stages, in leaky buildings, in trailers that we would not put a prisoner in, but we put our children in it and we tell teachers to teach there. They are hot in the summer and they are cold in the winter and that is wrong, absolutely wrong and unacceptable in a country that has the resources that we have.

We ought to be investing. It would not take a lot. It would only take just a few small pennies of what we have here to make a difference all across America. The baby boom echo presents an immediate crisis in many states. My home State happens to be one of those. It is one of the fastest growing States in America.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must take action to build quality schools for our children. We not only have that responsibility, we have that obligation. As these 53 million-plus students head back to school this fall, they will know that we did not live up to our obligation last year. I trust we will not adjourn in October without meeting that obligation this year. We have that responsibility and that obligation. Too many of these children again this year will be stuck in trailers, shoved in closets, crammed into bathrooms that were converted to classrooms, and gyms and other substandard facilities and in some cases buildings that do not have glass in the windows. That is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, how do we tell a child that education is really important when they just rode by a new prison to go to an old rundown school building? That is not right. It is not right in America. It is not acceptable.

Our communities need help to build quality schools where good order and discipline fosters a positive learning environment for our children. Our teachers deserve it also.

Mr. Speaker, let me close this evening finally by saying there is another issue I want to touch on just briefly that my State has worked on, and I have introduced legislation in this Congress and trust that it will pass. That is on character education. We did a survey in my State of 25,000 students, teachers, parents and school

employees and nearly one-third of them indicated that they did not treat their teachers with respect. This was in 1989–90, 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we put in place character education. We started out with ethics education and turned it into character education. It is now part of the curriculum in our State and it is making a difference. It is integrated into the curriculum. It is not separate.

It teaches such thing as trustworthiness. Who can disagree with that? Respect. Who can disagree with that? Responsibility, caring, fairness, citizenship, perseverance, courage and self-discipline. We can all agree with that. Those are American traits. Every child should be taught that. It makes a difference in their life, they are better students as a result of it, and those classrooms and schools across North Carolina that have instituted it, they are seeing discipline problems go down and academics go up. All we need to do is look at what is happening in North Carolina. It is making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, as I close this evening, I would call on my colleagues to step up to the plate, as we say in baseball, and face up to the responsibility that we have an obligation to fund the 100,000 teachers so children can be taught in smaller classes and make sure that we have the classrooms children can learn in and teachers can teach in. So that parents once again will have the kind of respect they need to have because they feel we put the money where we ought to put it and invest it in the future and we ought to be putting the character opportunities to teach.

As the parent of two teachers, with a wife who teaches, and children who have gone through the public school, I will say this evening that our future is in the K–12 public schools in America where 90-plus percent of all of our children go. We cannot turn our backs on the opportunity for all of our children.

FEDERAL RESERVE MONETARY POLICY: IS GREENSPAN'S FED THE WORLD CENTRAL BANK?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, William McDonough of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York stated, ''The most important asset a central bank possesses is public confidence.'' He went on in that speech to note that, ''I am increasingly concerned that in a democracy, a central bank can maintain price stability over the intermediate and long term only when it has public support for necessary policies.''

Public confidence here can only mean the confidence of the Members of Congress in our oversight capacity. Most of the American public to this very day have not the least interest in, awareness of, or knowledge of the Federal Reserve System, our central bank.

□ 2100

But most members feel that Allan Sproul, another former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, was quite correct in his letter, still quoted by Fed officials, that Fed independence ''does not mean independence from the government but independence within the government. In performing its major task, the administration of monetary policy, the Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Congress set up in a special form to bear the responsibility for that particular task which constitutionally belongs to the Legislative Branch of the government.''

Clearly that form of argument appeals to most Members today. The construct is a masterpiece, not just for being true, Congress did abdicate its enumerated powers, but for letting even those of us responsible for the oversight off the hook; the Treasury does not rule the Fed; the White House does not rule the Fed; and this Congress does not fulfill its supervisory responsibility either.

The current Fed Chairman, Alan Greenspan, will soon testify before this House, expressing his independence. As the journal Central Banking recently noted regarding the Fed, ''It has acquired an air of sanctity, politicians hesitate to bait the Fed for fear of looking stupid.'' As a result, and still quoting from Central Banking, ''the Feds accountability is less than it appears. The Fed is always accountable in the sense that Congress could bring it to heel if it really wanted to.''

The Fed has not done too badly in some areas, as the economy demonstrates, most notably where inflation and interest rates today are resting. Whether they remain even close to where they are come a year or two from now may, indeed, be an altogether different story. Mr. Greenspan has been pretty clear about what is now important in Fed policy.

Let me quote from some past testimony. ''The Federal Reserve believes that the main contribution it can make to enhancing the long-term health of the United States economy is to promote price stability over time. Our short-run policy adjustments, while necessarily undertaken against the background of the current condition of the U.S. economy, must be consistent with moving towards the long-range goal of price stability.''

The reality is that monetary policy can never put the economy exactly where Greenspan might want it to be. He knows full well that supply shocks that drive up prices suddenly, like the two major oil shocks of the 1970s, are always going to be with us. More so than ever as the process of globalization continues to transform the world's economies.

The United States Federal Reserve is leading this global transformation. Some are quietly arguing, over lunch mostly, that Greenspan is in charge of what he may already believe to be the World Federal Reserve, the World Central Bank.

There is good reason to suggest this. As Robert Pringle noted some time ago in Central Banking, ''Central banks rather than governments are laying down the rules of the game for the new international financial system. The Fed is in the lead.''

Pringle went on to argue, and now I am quoting him again at length, ''If the Fed's record during the debt crisis and in exchange rate management is mixed, most observers would give it full marks for the way it dealt with the stock market crash of 1987. It is not clear that the verdict of history will be as favorable. After being prodded into action, some central banks, notably those of Japan and England, went on madly pumping money into the system long after the danger was passed, creating an unsustainable boom and reigniting inflationary pressures.''

I am still quoting, ''Well, our Fed can hardly be blamed for that. The real problem was that Greenspan's action risked creating the expectation among investors that the Board of Governors would support U.S. stock markets in the future. Clearly, the action was prompted by the need to protect banks from the risks to which they were exposed to firms in the securities markets.

''Equally, this support signaled an extension of the central bank's safety net to an area of the financial system where investors are traditionally expected to bear the risks themselves. It is no accident that after 1987 the bull market really took off. It has never looked back.''

I have quoted this section in the article by Robert Pringle that appeared in Central Banking because we are hearing much the same fears expressed today, though quietly over lunch, by phone, by rumor, by investors and money managers throughout the United States.

Not too long ago, former Fed Chairman Paul Volker strongly suggested that our current boom is driven almost exclusively by the major international firms in the high-tech industry and the 40 industrials. Clearly, this is due to the fact that these few giant monopolies dominate the world market. Therefore, this boom reflects less what is happening here in America than what is going on in the world to these few monopolies' financial benefits.

I am not entirely complaining, mind you. Where these few giant firms are concerned, some American workers do benefit. But more foreign workers benefit than American; more investors and owners benefit than workers; more very wealthy individuals benefit than the middle class bedrock.

My problem is that Greenspan's Fed seems to believe money does not matter. That we can create vast sums of cash and pump it into the financial markets at will, manipulate the adjusted monetary base to even greater

heights, or plummet to the depths; all this done toward long-term price stability. Has Greenspan so rejected Milton's theory that to do so one guarantees inflationary pressures in the road ahead along with savage corrections when actions become necessary by, once again, the same Fed?

Can Greenspan seriously argue the Fed has not created the worst bubble in history, the worst speculation ever witnessed, with millions of day traders gambling their small fortunes, wishing to become, each of them, another Bill Gates? Clearly, Greenspan sent a signal once again to investors that the stock market bears no risk for the middle class citizen.

During 1995, it was Mexico's turn again. As Pringle pointed out, ''the American administration panicked. Again, the Federal Reserve was there to help, even though there was less reason for central banks to get involved than in 1982, since there was less risk to the international banking system.''

As Pringle goes on to State, ''Again European central bankers were annoyed at the lack of consultation. You do not need to be a populist politician to suspect that Wall Street was calling the shots, especially with former senior partner of Goldman Sachs, Robert Rubin, as U.S. Treasury Secretary.''

One of the most important arguments regarding Greenspan's Fed's ability to save the world was put forward in this journal Central Banking, and I quote, ''The Fed's good record of achievement in controlling inflation over these years contrasts with its mixed record of market management. Its Achilles heel is moral hazard. It has not been so good at preventive medicine or in taking into account the long-term effects of its actions on the behavior of governments and market participants.''

It is precisely the long-term effects of Fed monetary policy that should concern Congress. If that is not our oversight role, what is? It is precisely the long-term effects on market participants that should concern Congress. If that is not our oversight role, what is? What are the long-term effects of Fed monetary policy going to be on government?

Now, certainly Congress can get behind that question, if not in our oversight role on behalf of the American people generally, and the ill-informed market participants that are creating this speculation bubble in the mistaken belief that the stock market no longer bears any risk, if not in their behalf, then maybe in our own congressional self-interest.

We have witnessed some rather disturbing policy stratagems in just the last, say, 10 months or so. Greenspan's Fed began around August and September of last year, 1999, to expand the money supply, the adjusted monetary base, from around $500 billion to nearly $625 billion, a $70 billion run up, in anticipation of potential Y2K effects. This enormous expansion flowed directly into the financial markets and helped create the enormous boom in stock prices prior to that year's end. The speculation was seen primarily in high-tech stocks.

Then comes the sudden and nearly precisely the same spike downward of the same Adjusted Monetary Base right after the year ends and 2000 begins. There were no problems with Y2K. This spike downward lasted until around April of the year 2000. That is this year.

We know the savage corrections the stock market displayed and that there were more losers than winners. All we ever hear about is the winners one sees, not the thousands or the millions of losers. Why do we hear so little about the losers in the media? Because, so the argument goes, the market returned to almost normal. The market bounced back, so the argument goes, certainly, as the Fed began once again to pump up the monetary base around April.

But, the losers remain losers, and lost homes, businesses and bankruptcies continue to reach all time highs. Personal debt, especially credit card debt, and equity finance debt have reached unheard of levels.

This is the speculation, no, let us call it what it really is, gambling, this is the gambling that is today our U.S. stock market.

One will not hear the White House complain. Only praise for Clinton's appointee shall be the sounding out, ringing out the bell in praise for White House management of the economy. One will not hear that from the very speculative bubble created during the last 6 months of 1999. One will not hear that from the quickest investor who took their profits before the inevitable downturn and before the downturn came and before the corrections that came.

Investors were paid handsomely for their gains in capital gains taxes levied. It is no surprise to Fed watchers that the taxes collected from capital gains nearly equaled the much hailed government surplus that Clinton soberly explained was due to his wise leadership of the economy.

If the surplus was really generated by wise leadership of the White House, why is not the government's debt going down? Do not confuse the government debt with some mythical balanced budget.

For a Federal central bank, the concentration of power at the top is very marked. True, although the Board of Governors sets the discount rate and reserve requirements, the execution of monetary policy on an ongoing basis is decided by the larger 12-member Federal Open Market Committee. But the FOMC brings only five voting Reserve Bank presidents, of which the New York bank is always one, leaving the Washington Governors in the majority. They run it. The influence of the chairman alone can sometimes be near to overwhelming.

As an historical note, and I taught history and government, so forgive me, Congress insisted on scattering 12 regional Federal Reserve Banks across the country when the system was devised so that the east could not restrict credit elsewhere. Interestingly, these Federal Reserves were chartered as private institutions in which local banks owned all the stock.

That is still true today with the outside directors on the board of a Reserve Bank, a mix of representatives from small and large member banks in the district, as well as representatives from industry, commerce and the public.

□ 2115

What was intended here was a sort of balancing; three bankers with six nonbankers on each Federal Reserve Board. Supposedly this would put the lenders at a disadvantage to the borrowing classes, which would outnumber the lenders six to three.

The boards choose the Reserve Bank presidents, always from the lending class, but do so only with the approval of the seven-member Federal Reserve Board in Washington. Thus, we can readily see that the bankers, the lenders, clearly dominate the Federal Reserve System itself. Even though at the regional Feds the distinction I just made is superficially valid, many of the nonbank directors are tied inextricably to banking itself or sit on separate boards of directors where bankers rest as well. Nor is the public sector category so clear. Many nonindustry participants on these boards have close ties to banking and banking's network of consultants, academics, and financial management roles clearly bank related.

Just how much power any one regional president has is still debated in inner circles. Previous efforts at restricting Reserve Bank presidents' powers have been dismissed on the grounds that their powers were a proper delegation of authority by Congress.

Allowing that the Federal Reserve is a quasi- government agency, it remains the only government agency in which private individuals, along with Government-appointed officials, together make government policy. Let me repeat that. The Federal Reserve is a quasi-government agency. It remains the only government agency in which private individuals, along with government-appointed individuals, together make government policy. It remains a solid fact that these regional bank presidents cast extremely important votes on public policies that in the present as well as the future affect the economic lives of every American. Yet, and this is the point to my digression, they lack the public accountability because they lack the public legitimacy to be making these decisions, especially these kinds of decisions, some of whose recent effects I have just pointed out.

No one can any longer deny that the Federal Reserve System dominates the

U.S. economy; that its decisions, more than even so-called market forces, which is a sham notion under managed competition in any case, affect everybody's lives and well-being; that within the decision-making process delegated to the Federal Reserve, the Board of Governors clearly dominates the process; that within that Board of Governors the chairman, and this is not intended to single out Mr. Greenspan but to apply to all past and future chairmen, that the chairman dominates the Board.

This does not seem to concern this Congress, but history will record the result; and the people of America may not like that result. Our founders and our constitution carefully limited the power of the President and of the Congress, but now we have an unelected Board of Governors with power, for good or for mischief, immense power, over our national monetary policy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and July 25 on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Washington (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2812. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9180. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Policies, Types of Loans, Loan Requirement-Telecommunications Program (RIN: 0572–AB53) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9181. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order [FV–99–701–FR] (RIN: 0581–AB78) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9182. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301014; FRL–6594–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9183. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacillus subtillis Strain QST 713; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300997; FRL–6555–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9184. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methoxyfenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3-methoxy-2-methyl-2-(3,5-dimethylbenzoyl)-2- (1,1-dimethylethyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300983; FRL–6496–5] (RIN:2070–AB78) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9185. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting Cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 106—273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9186. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to study certain functions performed by military and civilian personnel in the Deparmtnet of the Navy (DON) for possible performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9187. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Defense Report: Appendix L: Resources Allocated to Mission and Support Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9188. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Force Management Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report for the Armed Services Retirement Home (AFRH) for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9189. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, ''Plan for Improved Demilitarization of Excess and Surplus Defense Property''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9190. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, ''Integrated Chemical and Biological Research, Development and Acquisition Plan for the Departments of Defense and Energy''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9191. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on portability of TRICARE Prime Benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Completed DoD A–76 Competitions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9193. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list of Vice Admiral Michael L. Bowman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9194. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list of Vice Admiral Henry C. Giffin III, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9195. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of Lieutenant General Richard A. Chilcoat, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9196. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of general on the retired list of General Anthony C. Zinni, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9197. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on proposed obligations for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9198. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of Lieutenant General Ronald R. Blanck, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9199. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the four issues of the Quarterly Journal that comprise the 1999 annual report to Congress of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9200. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting transactions involving exports to Chad and Cameroon, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(ii); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9201. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received

July 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9202. A letter from the Managing Director, Office of General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Election of Federal Home Loan Bank Directors (RIN: 3069–AB00) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9203. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Membership Regulation and Advances Regulation [No. 2000–30] (RIN: 3069–AA94) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9204. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Federal Home Loan Bank Advances, Eligible Collateral, New Business Activities and Related Matters [No. 2000–34] (RIN: 3069–AA97) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9205. A letter from the Director, Office of Management, transmitting the pay-as-you-go report, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

9206. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of additional technical amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) that supplements the Administration's ''Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2000,'' previously transmitted to Congress; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9207. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the 1999 Uranium Industry Annual, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2297h—10; to the Committee on Commerce.

9208. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference; Approval of Recodification of the Virginia Administrative Code; Correction [VA084/101–5045a; FRL–6726–4] received June 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce.

9209. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Phaffia Yeast (RIN: 97C–0466) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9210. A letter from the Acting Administrator, NHTS, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on Motor Vehicle Trunk Entrapment; to the Committee on Commerce.

9211. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revised 15% Plan for the Metropolitan Washington, DC Ozone Nonattainment Area [SIPTRAX NO. MD097–3050a; FRL–6735–4] received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9212. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program [DC 045–2020a; FRL–9838–5] received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9213. A letter from the Director, Office fo Regulatory Manangement and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Primary and Secondary Drinking Water Regulations: Analyical Methods for Chemical and Microbiological Contaminants and Revisions to Laboratory Certification Requirements; Technical Correction [WH–FRL–6726–2] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9214. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—OMB Approval Numbers for the Primacy Rule Under the Paperwork Reduction Act and Clarification of OMB Approval for the Consumer Confidence Report Rule [FRL–6726–3] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9215. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Manangement and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2000: Allocations for Metered—Dose Inhalers and the Space Shuttle and Titan Rockets [FRL–6726–5] (RIN: 2060–A173) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9216. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule -National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List [FRL–6727–2] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9217. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled, ''Privacy Online: Fair Information Practices in the Electronic Marketplace: A Report to Congress (May 2000)''; to the Committee on Commerce.

9218. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Haematoccus Algae Meal (RIN: 98C–0212) received 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9219. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 65th Annual Report Securities and Exchange Commission 1999, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78w(b); to the Committee on Commerce.

9220. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule 17Ac2–2 and Form TA–2 (RIN: 3235–AH44) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9221. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for the year 1999, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg(c)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

9222. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Denmark for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–53), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9223. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to United Kingdom for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–50), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9224. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–45), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9225. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–51), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9226. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to New Zealand for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–46), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9227. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Portugal for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–52), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9228. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Italy for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–49), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9229. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–54), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9230. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Poland for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–61), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9231. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Kourou, French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 073–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9232. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan and French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 061–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9233. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 071–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9234. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 041–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 054–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Singapore [Transmittal No. DTC 018–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially under a contract to Jordan [Transmittal No. DTC 069–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9238. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

9239. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

9240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Export Administration Regulations Entity List: Revisions to the Entity List [Docket No. 981019261–0207–03] (RIN: 0694–AB73) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9241. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passport Procedures—Amendment to Execution of Passport Application Regulation—received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 performance report on the Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9243. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Accountabilty Report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9244. A letter from the Deputy Director, Support Personal and Family Readiness Division, Department of Defense, transmitting the 1999 report of the Retirement Plan for Civilian Employees of the United States Marine Corps Personal and Family Readiness Division, and miscellaneous Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities are furnished as required by Public Law No. 95–595; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9245. A letter from the Director, Division and Program Development, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals With Disabilities; Separate Facility Waivers (RIN: 1215–AA84) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9246. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Chief Financial Officers Act Report for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9247. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Executive Summary Strategic Plan 2000–2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9248. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan U.S. Friendship Commission, transmitting a notice that the Commission did not engage in any activities that would be covered under the FAIR Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9249. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a legislative proposal, ''To amend title 5 United States Code, to extend the Federal physicians comparability allowance authority, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9250. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Change in the Survey Cycle for the Orleans, LA, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AJ05) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9251. A letter from the CFO & Plan Administrator, PCA Retirement Committee, Production Credit Association Retirement Plan, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1999 and a copy of the audited financial statements, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 12(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9252. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the systems of internal control and financial management for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9253. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Program Performance Report, combining the Accountability Report for 1999 with the Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9254. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for the period ending September 30, 1999 in accordance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9255. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9256. A letter from the the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2000, through June 30, 2000 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 106—272); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

9257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Engineering and Operations Division, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Producer-operated Outer Continental Shelf Pipelines that Cross Directly into State Waters (RIN: 1010–AC56) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9258. A letter from the Director, Office of RegulatoryManagement and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Change of Official EPA Mailing Address; Technical Amendments [FRL–6487–4] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9259. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Halibut Bycatch Mortality Allowance in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 000211040–0040–01; I.D. 051100D] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9260. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Removal of Vessel Moratorium of the GOA and BSAI [Docket No. 000706201–0201–01; I.D. 060700A] (RIN: 0648–AO00) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9261. A letter from the Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Fishing Activities [Docket No. 000511138–0138–01; I.D. 051100B] (RIN: 0648–A019) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9262. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Shrimp Trawling Requirements [Docket No. 991207322–0107–03; I.D. 041300A] (RIN: 0648–AN30) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9263. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Shrimp Trawl Activities; Leatherback Conservation Zone [Docket No. 991207322–0115–04; I.D. 042100B] (RIN: 0648–AN30) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9264. A letter from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 071400D] received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9265. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States Northeast Multispecies; Framework Adjustment 33 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan; Reporting Requirement [Docket No. 000407096–0196–02; I.D. 040300C] (RIN 0648–AN51) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9266. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Shrimp

Trawl [Docket No. 005519147–0147–01; I.D. 051800C] (RIN: 0648–AO22), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9267. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-second in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9268. A letter from the Executive Director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Society's annual report for the calendar year 1999 and the comprehensive report to the Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9269. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report beginning May 1, 1998, on the status of the United States Parole Commission (USPC); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9270. A letter from the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3052–AC01) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 237 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1996 entitled, ''Hopper Dredges: Ready Reserve Status of the Hopper Dredge Wheeler''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9272. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30107; Amdt. No. 1999] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9273. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30108; Amdt. No. 2000] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9274. A letter from the National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Transition to New National Driver Register [Docket No. NHTSA–00–7551] (RIN: 2127–AG68) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9275. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Oakley, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–20] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9276. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Columbia, MO [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–21] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9277. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Airspace Docket No. 2000–ASW–12] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9278. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Atwood, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–19] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9279. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–23–AD; Amendment 39–11812; AD 2000–14–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9280. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–600, -700, and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–209–AD; Amendment 39–11811; AD 2000–14–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9281. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–206–AD; Amendment 39–11813; AD 2000–14–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9282. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–155–AD; Amendment 39–11814; AD 2000–14–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9283. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–75–AD; Amendment 39–11816; AD 2000–14–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9284. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–192–AD; Amendment 39–11815; AD 2000–14–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9285. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the National Water Quality Inventory 1998 Report to Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9286. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of lease prospectuses for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Las Vegas, NV, US General Services Administration, Philadelphia, PA, and Rough and Ready Island, Stockton, CA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9287. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled, ''Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance Report''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9288. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' rule—Licensing of Private Land Remote-Sensing Space Systems [Docket No. 951031259–9279–03] (RIN: 0648–AC64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

9289. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report covering the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, overpayment and forfeiture by the Administrator in 1999, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9290. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the 2000 Annual Report Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104—193, section 231 (110 Stat. 2197); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9291. A letter from the Regulations Branch Chief, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Forced or Indentured Child Labor (RIN: 1515–AC36) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9292. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Laundromat Industry—received July 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9293. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reporting Requirements Update [DFARS Case 2000–D001] received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Select Comm Narcotics Abuse & Control.

9294. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a notice to oblicate $425.9 million in FY 2000 to implement the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program under the FY 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, pursuant to Public Law 104—106, section 1206(a) (110 Stat. 471); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

9295. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a notice to obligate certain previously notified in FY 1998 funds of up to $46.0 million, pursuant to Public Law 104—106, section 1206(a) (110 Stat. 471); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

9296. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the reponse to the Report of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission (the Commission); jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Ways and Means.

9297. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, ''To authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at the George Washington Memorial Parkway in McLean, Virginia.''; jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of July 20, 2000)

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4033. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests; with an amendment (Rept. 106–

776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4844. A bill to modernize the financing of the railroad retirement system and to provide enhanced benefits to employees and beneficiaries; with an amendment (Rept. 106–777 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3380. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal jurisdiction over offenses committed outside the United States by persons employed by or accompanying the Armed Forces, or by members of the Armed Forces who are released or separated from active duty prior to being identified and prosecuted for the commission of such offenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–778 Pt. 1).

[Submitted July 21, 2000]

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4446. A bill to ensure that the Secretary of Energy may continue to exercise certain authorities under the Price-Anderson Act through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety, and Health; with amendments (Rept. 106–694 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3383. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to remove separate treatment or exemption for nuclear safety violations by nonprofit institutions (Rept. 106–695 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 24, 2000]

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 2842. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage; with amendments (Rept. 106–779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits; with an amendment (Rept. 106–780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterams' Affairs. H.R. 4864. A bill to amend the title 38, United States Code, to reaffirm and clarify the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1283. A bill to establish legal standards and procedures for the fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos exposure, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterams' Affairs. H.R. 4850. A bill to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing compensation and life insurance benefits for veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on July 20, 2000]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Armed Services discharged. H.R. 3380 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of July 20, 2000]

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than September 15, 2000.

H.R. 3380. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than July 20, 2000.

H.R. 4844. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than July 27, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 4919. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 4920. A bill to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 4921. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the eligibility criteria for presumption of service-connection of certain diseases and disabilities for veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. EWING, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4922. A bill to ensure that certain controversial changes to the Environmental Protection Agency's total maximum daily load program and permit program be subjected to adequate public and congressional analysis and review.; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the renewal of distressed communities, to provide for 9 additional empowerment zones and increased tax incentives for empowerment zone development, to encourage investments in new markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Small Business, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4924. A bill to establish a 3-year pilot project for the General Accounting Office to report to Congress on economically significant rules of Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COOKSEY (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow more equitable and direct tax relief for health insurance and medical care expenses, to give Americans more options for obtaining quality health care, and to expand insurance coverage to the uninsured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4926. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Tiger Woods, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship, and in breaking barriers with grace and dignity by showing that golf is a sport for all people; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for FamilyCare coverage for parents of enrolled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Truckee watershed reclamation project for the reclamation and reuse of water; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4929. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the expansion of medical residency training programs in geriatric medicine; to the Committee on

Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORN (for himself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4931. A bill to provide for the training or orientation of individuals, during a Presidential transition, who the President intends to appoint to certain key positions, to provide for a study and report on improving the financial disclosure process for certain Presidential nominees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to expand access of children to health care; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KLINK (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4933. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reauthorize the program for veterans readjustment appointments within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. LAMPSON, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri):

H.R. 4934. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue a consumer product safety rule to prevent injuries to users of vending machines; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the size of the estate an incompetent veteran being furnished institutional care by the Department of Veterans Affairs may have without being subject to suspension of benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4936. A bill to increase the penalty imposed on a sexually violent offender who fails to comply with requirements to register or report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide relief to providers of services under the Medicare Program by correcting reductions in payment rates instituted under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access to health insurance and Medicare benefits for individuals ages 55 to 65 to be fully funded through premiums and antifraud provisions, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for payment of such premiums and of premiums for certain COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 4939. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination regarding exposure to hazardous substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WAMP (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 4940. A bill to designate the museum operated by the Secretary of Energy in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, as the ''American Museum of Science and Energy'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for the reliability of the electric power transmission system in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the first amendment right to freely exercise religious beliefs without the fear of governmental condemnation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 562. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House, with amendments, in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1167; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 148: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 488: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 531: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 534: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FORD, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 797: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 860: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 920: Mr. FILNER
H.R. 1227: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1399: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1606: Mr. TIERNEY
H.R. 1621: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 1731: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1850: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1871: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1890: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1982: Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 2121: Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2562: Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 2710: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2814: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2870: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 2902: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 3044: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3083: Mr. REYES, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3091: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 3105: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3170: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3235: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3377: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 3463: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3571: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3806: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3825: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3850: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3880: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3907: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3983: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANNER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3998: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4001: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 4030: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4178: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. COX.
H.R. 4213: Mr. BUYER and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4215: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 4236: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 4239: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 4259: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4271: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 4272: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 4273: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 4328: Mr. BATEMAN.
H.R. 4357: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 4395: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.
H.R. 4410: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 4492: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4543: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 4547: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 4550: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 4567: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4644: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 4664: Mr. FROST and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 4673: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 4677: Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 4740: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4746: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 4756: Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 4759: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 4807: Mr. MOORE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. QUINN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CAPUANO,

Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WU, Ms. DANNER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4825: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 4827: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 4848: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. OSE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 4850: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 4856: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4864: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEY, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4888: Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. COX, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4894: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 4895: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 4902: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 4907: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. GOODE.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 327: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 363: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. HOYER.

H. Con. Res. 370: Mr. PORTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 372: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H. Con. Res. 375: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Res. 543: Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 544: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. DREIER.

H. Res. 548: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LARGENT.

H. Res. 549: Mr. BUYER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Res. 561: Ms. CARSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SUNUNU.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. __

(D.C. APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2001)

OFFERED BY: MR. TIAHRT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) No person may distribute any needle or syringe for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug in any area of the District of Columbia which is within 1000 feet of a public or private day care center, elementary school, vocational school, secondary school, college, junior college, or university, or any public housing project, public swimming pool, park, playground, video arcade, or youth center, or an event sponsored by any such entity.

(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $500 for each needle or syringe distributed in violation of such subsection.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amount collected by the District of Columbia pursuant to subsection (b) shall be deposited in a separate account of the General Fund of the District of Columbia and used exclusively to carry out (either directly or by contract) drug prevention or treatment programs. For purposes of this subsection, no program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug may be considered a drug prevention or treatment program.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 24, 2000 No. 97

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, July 21, 2000)

The Senate met at 12:01 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, You know us as we really are. You know the inner person behind highly polished exteriors. You know when we are tired and need Your strength. You know about our worries and anxieties and offer Your comfort. You understand our fears and frustrations and assure us of Your presence. You feel our hurts and infuse Your healing love. Flood our inner being with Your peace so that we can live with confidence and courage.

At 3:40 p.m. today, we will remember the sacrifice in the line of duty of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson. Continue to bless their families. Help us to express our gratitude to the officers who serve in Congress with such faithfulness. Now we commit this day to You, for You are our Lord. Amen.

f

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHARLES GRASSLEY, Senator from the State of Iowa, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

f

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

f

SCHEDULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. For the leader, I would like to announce today's program. The Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators DURBIN and THOMAS in control of the time.

Following morning business, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill with amendments in order to that bill. Those Senators who have amendments should work with the bill managers on a time to offer their amendments as soon as possible.

f

ORDER FOR MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. As a reminder to all Members, on this date 2 years ago, Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson were killed in the line of duty while defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun. In honor of this anniversary, I now ask unanimous consent that at 3:40 p.m. today, there be a moment of silence to honor these two officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank my colleagues for their attention.

f

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

f

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee, 12 to 1 p.m.; Senator THOMAS or his designee, 1 to 2 p.m.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business, with the time to come from Senator THOMAS' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

HOCUS POCUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to note that there are some things happening around here of late that make me wonder if we are in an episode of the X-Files. I am troubled with the mysterious appearance and disappearance of funds within the conference report for Military Construction. In the effort to develop an emergency spending package, the House included money for meth lab clean-up. It voted on money. The Senate-passed bill had money for meth lab clean-up. Both Houses of Congress recognized that there was a real emergency. Both bodies recognized the need to provide emergency money to DEA to help pay for the costs of cleaning up the toxic waste dumps caused by illegal meth production.

I and other members of this body have been concerned for some time about this problem. We have written the President, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, the Attorney General, and the Majority Leader and members of the Committee on Appropriations. The Majority Whip of the Senate had an emergency meth spending item accepted as part of the bill passed by the Senate. But it seems we've had a case of alien abduction. All—all the meth money disappeared in conference and no one seems to know how or why. The House included money. The Senate included money. The conference to reconcile the differences, however, included no money. What this means is strange math in which one plus one equals zero.

Mr. President, I have participated in various conferences with the other body, and I know they can be complicated affairs. Strong disagreements can exist over how to phrase a section,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

or how much funding this particular project should receive. But there have always been some guidelines governing a conference. First, you are working toward a compromise. This means, by definition, you are not going to get everything you want. However, it also means you will get something that will work. Second, in a conference, you aren't starting from scratch. Each body has reviewed, debated, and passed a version of legislation—a starting point, if you will, for compromise.

These compromises, often difficult to arrive at, are worked out behind closed doors. Out of the watchful eye of the public. Legislating can be an ugly process, and often negotiations continue in a much more open and frank manner in private than under the media microscope. But compromise should not be the occasion for legislating afresh, for ignoring the expressed intent of majorities in both Houses.

Looking through the Military Construction Appropriations bill this last week, I was distressed at some of the items I found that seem to have magically appeared. 6 C–130Js and a new Gulf Stream 5 for the Coast Guard, for example. So far as I know, the Coast Guard did not ask for a Gulf Stream, and we did not vote for one. But there it is.

At the same time, it seems that needed funds to support the DEA's continued assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies to clean up methamphetamine labs have disappeared—and no one seems to know where it went.

Heading into the conference, it was clear what the situation was. The House had provided $15 million in emergency funds for needed methamphetamine lab-cleanup. The Senate provided a total of $50 million for meth-related activities by the DEA—$10 million was added in Committee, and an additional $40 million was adopted on the floor for ''initiatives to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking.'' So you would think—I certainly thought—that the conferees would return with some funding—most likely between $15 and $50 million—for meth lab clean-up.

But something happened in the conference. Someone waved a magic wand, and ''Poof!'' The money is gone. Where did it go? The conferees don't know. Why is it gone? The sponsors of the funds don't know. I don't know. Inquiries have left me feeling like Jimmy Stewart commenting on the evidence in his case in the 1959 movie classic, ''Anatomy of a Murder,'' where he notes evidence appears and disappears in a ghostly fashion. But what I do know is that I have to explain this to my constituents—to the law enforcement agencies in Iowa who are dependent upon these funds to support their clean up efforts of these mini environmental catastrophes. I am not alone.

All of this funding hocus pocus I find to be very troubling. I hope we can solve the mystery and avoid its like in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask to speak as if in morning business, and I believe my time is taken from the time controlled by Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

f

THE CONFERENCE PROCESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want to follow on with the comments of my good friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and praise him for pointing out that the conference system is becoming bankrupt.

Way too often conferees put in measures and take out measures that have nothing to do with the underlying bill that goes to conference. It is becoming so bad that I think sometime—my hope is in the next Congress—the Senator from Iowa, myself, and others should meet with our leadership to prevent this from continually happening. It bankrupts the process. It also causes more Americans to become even more concerned about the political process. We, as Senators, cannot go home and say what is or is not happening. Rather, we have to go home and report just what the Senator from Iowa reported—that somehow, by magic or by mystery, things sort of appear and disappear. It does not make us feel good as Senators because we like to know what is occurring. It certainly doesn't help our constituents feel any better about the process because they hope we know what is happening. More than that, they hope we are fighting for their case. But if we don't know the contents of the conference process, we don't know how something gets put in or taken out, and we look foolish. It is a major abrogation of our responsibility as a Senate to the American people for whom we work. They are, after all, our employers. At times, the Senate is too secretive.

It reminds me of an incident I was involved in when I first came to the House more than 20-some years ago. At that time, I was a freshman House Member. I had a few free minutes one afternoon—about an hour or two. I thought that I would go to the conference on the tax bill; I might learn something. I thought I would go to the conference and learn a little about tax law and the conference process.

I called around to try to figure out where the conference was meeting. Nobody would tell me. At that time, Mike Mansfield from Montana was the majority leader of the Senate. I thought I could call Senator Mansfield's office; certainly they could tell me where the conference was meeting. They did. They told me. It was in the big hearing room over in the Longworth Building. There was a policeman standing at the door leading to the executive room. I knew what was going on. He challenged me. I said I was a Member. I intended to reply that I was a member of the conference, but, rationalizing, I said I was a Member of Congress, and he waved me in.

I walked back into the executive room. There were Senate Members in the hearing room on one side of the table with conferees, and Russell Long was at the table with House conferees. Russell Long was talking about when he was a kid in Louisiana. It was great listening to it. There was a sea of executive branch people. In the hearing room with Treasury Secretary Simon was a sea of Treasury employees.

I took an out-of-the-way spot. I found a chair over on the side, and I sat down out of the way to watch. After about 10 minutes, Congressman Jim Burke from Massachusetts shuffled over to me—an elderly man. He came to me and said: I am sorry. I have to ask you to leave. Leave? Why? He said it was just the rules. I said respectfully that I would like to know what rule was requiring me to leave. He said, well, it is the Senate rules. So I said, well, I appreciate that. As a House Member, I wanted to know which Senate rule it was that prohibited my attendance as a Member of Congress watching this conference. He said, well, it is just the Senate rule.

I thought for a while. I thought: That is wrong; it is not right. I am not going to make a big fuss about it right here; I will later. I am going to leave because he asked me to leave, but I will see what I can do about it. It is the rule.

For example, Congressman Bill Green couldn't be there either. Bill Green was then a Congressman and the member of the House Ways and Means Committee in the House who authored a provision to delete the depletion allowance that was in the House bill. Even he could not attend, the rule then being nobody could attend a conference except conferees—nobody else. But there were more people from the executive branch. They were there, along with Treasury Secretary Simon.

I came over to the House floor. I mentioned this to Congressman Mikva from Illinois. He said: MAX, you are entirely right. That is wrong. I have been fighting that rule for years.

A few of us stood up on the House floor that afternoon and explained how we thought it was wrong. In the next session of Congress, the rules were changed. Afterwards, all conferences were totally open to the public.

I know some Members of Congress don't like that. They do not like the sun shining in conferences. But that was the rule. We started it back then. I think it is in the public interest. It is a good rule.

It seems things have changed slowly; conferences should not be secret. They are bipartisan. Both political parties attend, but often the minority party is shut out. One wonders what is happening. The real danger is, if and when the Democrats are in the majority, the Democrats are going to be tempted to do the same thing. It is wrong. Neither side should do that. They should be

much more open and much more closely should enforce that rule, and matters not pertaining to the conference should not be included in the conference report. It is something we have to stand up and enforce for the good of the Senate and for the good of the country; otherwise, there will be chaos, or anarchy, or a dictatorship—whatever it is.

Based upon the comments of my good friend, I am very inclined to work with him next year to see if we can do something about that. I think there are many others in the Senate who share the same view. It has gotten out of hand.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for the statement.

f

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADING RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to speak a few words on a matter that will be coming before this body, I hope, later this week; that is, beginning the process of the United States agreeing to extend permanent normal trading relations status with China.

I would like to step back for a few moments and reflect a bit on its significance and on its implications. The irony is that we are even talking about this today because I think the bill to grant China PNTR has the strong support of at least three-fourths of the Senate. It is deeply in our national interest. I wish it had been passed some time ago. Actually, we should have passed it months ago. Instead, we have had to struggle to find time to consider it in this chamber. We are now approaching the eleventh hour of this session of Congress with a week left this month and a few weeks in September.

I personally believe this issue should have been handled differently. We should have brought it up much earlier. But later is better than never. I am glad we are finally approaching the denouement.

For over two millennia, China was ruled by a series of imperial dynasties. The last Emperor was overthrown in 1912. Warlords, dictators, and the Japanese military then took over parts of the country at various times.

In 1949, the Chinese Communists took control of the entire Chinese mainland. Chiang Kai-shek and his supporters were forced to flee to Taiwan. Then followed three decades of absolute, totalitarian, Communist rule by Mao Zedong.

To oversimplify, in 1979, Deng Xiaoping signaled the beginning of the end of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology as the underlying construct of the Chinese economy, polity, and society.

Another critical turning point was Deng's so-called ''Southern Journey'' in 1992. He visited Shenzhen, other parts of Guangdong Province, and Shanghai. On that journey, he advocated more economic openness, faster growth, and more rapid progress toward a market-based economy.

For the next two decades, we witnessed both progress and retreat in China's economic and political developments. Dramatic opening to foreign products and foreign investment. Yet a continuing government effort to maintain control over telecommunications.

The massacre of students at Tiananmen Square in 1989. Yet relatively unfettered access today by many Chinese to the Internet. Repeated violations of contract sanctity. Yet the development of domestic stock markets and Chinese companies placing issues on foreign stock exchanges.

The battle in China between the forces of reform and the forces of reaction continues. No one can predict how it will end, or when. But it is certainly in the vital interest of the United States to do everything we can to support those who favor reform over totalitarianism. Those who favor private enterprise over state-owned enterprises.

That means we must work to incorporate China into the international community. We need to engage China with the goal of promoting responsible behavior internally and externally. Encouraging them to play by international rules. Integrating the Chinese economy into the market-driven, middle-class, participatory economies of the West.

Economic reforms never have an easy time. And the forces in China that want to maintain the status quo are strong.

But, economic reform, moving to a market economy, transparency, direct foreign investment, listing of companies on overseas markets. Progress in all these areas is of vital importance to the United States as they relate to stability in China, accountability, and the development of a middle class. China's entry into the WTO will help anchor and sustain these economic reform efforts and empower economic reformers. China will not become a market-driven economy overnight. But it is in our interest that they move in this direction. And the WTO will help the process.

Around the world, we have seen that economic growth leads to the development of a large and strong middle class. Eventually, the middle class makes demands on political leaders for greater participation, accountability, and openness. It takes time. For example, eighty years ago, the Kuomintang, the KMT, was created by the same Soviet advisors who created the Chinese Communist Party. Fifty years ago, the KMT massacred Taiwanese citizens. Twenty years ago, the KMT still ruled Taiwan under martial law. Yet Taiwan just held its second truly democratic election.

There are many other examples. Look at Korea. A quarter of a century ago, the Korean government tried to murder the dissident Kim Dae Jung. Now, President Kim Dae Jung has begun to transform Korea's economic structure. He has traveled to Pyongyang in one of the most remarkable initiatives in modern world history. He is worried about being turned out of office in the next democratic election; such is the way of democracy.

The Philippines in 1986, Thailand in 1990, Indonesia in 1999. They all showed us the power of the development of a middle class. There is nothing fundamentally unique about China that makes a similar type of change impossible, or even improbable, over time.

Once China joins the WTO, China will be accountable for its behavior to the outside world, for perhaps the first time in history. The dispute settlement system at the WTO is far from perfect. Many members are working to open up dispute settlements and make it more available to the outside world. I have been among its most vociferous critics. But WTO dispute settlement will allow other countries to examine Chinese domestic economic practices.

It will force China to explain actions that other members believe violate global rules for the first time in world history. When a violation is found, it will put pressure on China to change and comply with the internationally accepted rules of the WTO. Not a perfect organization, but certainly better than none. This type of external scrutiny of China is virtually unprecedented. It has implications that may go far beyond trade, as China learns about the need to respect the rule of law among nations.

Let me turn to Taiwan for a moment. Taiwan will accede to the WTO very shortly after China does. What will happen when both enjoy full membership?

They will participate together, along with all other WTO members, in meetings ranging from detailed technical sessions to Ministerial level gatherings. There will be countless opportunities for interaction at many levels. Under the WTO's most-favored-nation rule, they will have to provide each other the same benefits that they grant to all other members. That is a very important principle. Taiwan's current policy limiting direct transportation, communication, and investment with the mainland will not stand up to WTO scrutiny. Each will be able to use the WTO dispute settlement mechanism against the other. They will have to meet directly and deal with economic differences in a peaceful way.

Presumably, either could take reservations, such as a national security exception, against the other in certain areas. That is a decision still to be made. But, no matter what, membership in the WTO and WTO-induced liberalization will increase and deepen ties between Taiwan and the PRC in trade, investment, technology, transportation, information, communications, and travel. And that has to contribute to the maintenance of peace across the Taiwan Strait.

China is emerging from one hundred and fifty years of national torpor. How we in America, and how the leadership in China, manage this relationship will

set the stage for regional and global politics, security, and economics for decades to come.

We must make a profound choice. Do we bring China into the orbit of the global trading community with its rule of law? Or do we choose to isolate and contain China, creating a 21st century version of the cold war in Asia?

It is a truism in international relations that rising powers have proven to be the most dangerous. Germany at the end of the 1800s and the Soviet Union in the 1940s. But this is not 1900 or 1945. As the world has become smaller for us because of revolutions in information, transportation, and production, so for China has the world come closer.

China is not our enemy. China is not our friend. The issue for us is how to engage China, and this means engagement with no illusions. Engagement with a purpose. How do we steer China's energies into productive, peaceful and stable relationships within the region and globally? For just as we isolate China at our peril, we engage them to our advantage.

Incorporation of China into the WTO, and that includes granting them PNTR, is a national imperative for the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

f

THE BELL TOLLS FOR THEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today, as the Senate recalls the tragic loss two years ago of two fine Capitol Police Officers, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, our hearts also bear fresh bruises from the loss of a Senator and a former Senator.

Mr. President, on Saturday I traveled with several other Senators to Atlanta, GA, to attend the funeral of our late Senate colleague, Paul Coverdell. Senator Coverdell's departure from this life had been sudden. It had come without warning. Paul was only 61 and he could look forward to many fruitful years of service to the Nation and to his people. But it was not to be. The Scriptures tell us:

> As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, So he flourishes. For the wind passes over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more.

On Wednesday of last week, I journeyed to Rhode Island with several other Senators to pay our last respects to a late departed former colleague, John O. Pastore, and to commiserate with his bereaved family and a great host of friends. We said the last goodbye to a man who had given much to the service of his country and who had retired from this body 26 years ago. A great throng paid homage to the remembrance of one whom they loved and who had served them so well, as was the case with our beloved late colleague, Paul Coverdell. There was a great throng, a large church filled to overflowing.

In both instances to which I have just referred, the choirs sang beautifully, the eulogies came forth from wounded hearts, the final farewells were spoken; then the crowds departed, and each person went on his or her own way to family hearth and home.

Over a long life of more than 80 years I have traveled this same journey many times. It is always the same. We travel the last mile with a departed friend and we come to the end of the way, when we can go no farther. That is as far as we can go. There we must part forever—insofar as this earthly life is concerned. From there, the loved one must go on alone, to ''The undiscovered country,'' as Shakespeare said, ''from whose bourne no traveler returns''.

So it is, and so it has been since the very beginning of our race, and so it will be in all the years to come. We are here today, and gone tomorrow.

> The clock of life is wound but once,
> And no man has the power to know just when the clock will strike,
> At late or early hour.
> Now is the only time you have, so live, love, work with a will;
> Put no faith in tomorrow for the clock may then be still.

Mr. President, John Pastore lived to be the ripe old age of 93; for Paul Coverdell, the grim reaper beckoned earlier, and the end came at 61. For those of us who remain on this side of the vale of trials and tears, the message from both of these lives is clear: be ready, be ready to go. William Cullen Bryant said it for you and for me:

> All that breathes will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh when thou art gone, the solemn brood of care plod on, and each one as before will chase his favorite phantom; . . .

As one who has lived in this town of inflated egos for nearly half a century, I can testify that William Cullen Bryant had it right. I have seen the great, the near great, those who thought they were great, those who would never become great, and each incoming wave of life's sea surges forward on the sands of humanity's rocky coast, and then, just as quickly recedes into the vast emptiness of the past. But what cannot be washed away is the love and the memory of man's deeds and service to his fellowman.

So, each of us will carry within ourselves the memory of Senator Pastore's, Senator Coverdell's, Officer Chestnut's, and Detective Gibson's deeds and service to his fellow man. They have touched all of us, and we have been changed by them, because it was Tennyson who said, ''I am part of all that I have met.'' And so, in this small way, they live on in our hearts and in our dedication to do good with the hours and days that remain to us. The poet John Donne expressed it well, how each man's life—and each man's death—touches ours:

> No man is an island, entire of itself;
> Every man is a piece of the continent,
> A part of the main;
> If a clod be washed away by the sea,
> [America] is the less,
> As well as if a promontory were,
> As well as if a manor of thy friend's
> Or of thine own were;
> Any man's death diminishes me,
> Because I am involved in mankind;
> And therefore
> Never send to know for whom the bell tolls:
> It tolls for thee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I realize there are some 6 minutes left under the time agreement for the Democratic leadership to be able to have comments during the first hour; and then we will have an hour under the control of Senator THOMAS. But I will use my leader time now so we will not take the remaining 6 minutes of the Democratic time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, with regard to the week's schedule, we had hoped we would be making progress now on the energy and water appropriations bill. But a disagreement developed on Friday afternoon, and we are continuing to see if we can work through that. I have spoken to Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of the energy and water appropriations subcommittee, about trying to find a way to proceed.

It is very important legislation for our country. It does involve appropriations for the Energy Department, the very important nuclear weapons labs, as well as water projects all over this country in which Members and States and various groups are very interested. So I hope we can find a way to proceed on that.

It has been held up, basically, by a disagreement over how to handle the water levels on the Missouri River, affecting the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, and perhaps others downstream. It is not easy to reconcile or to come to an agreement because there are very strong feelings about it, and it is very important to local areas. I know Senator DOMENICI is ready to proceed. He will be over later to make some comments about the importance of this legislation.

We also hope to take up the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill this week. It should not be that controversial. I understand there may be some amendments to it; It may take some time, but that is understandable. That is fine. We could do that and still

conclude that legislation probably in a day or so.

We had hoped that during the pendency of the week we could also go to the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. We had hoped to do all three of them, or at least two of the three, and make some progress on Commerce-State-Justice.

We also would like to proceed to the intelligence authorization bill. As is always the case, after the Armed Services Defense authorization bill for the year is done, we, in relatively short order, then go to the intelligence authorization. I do not need to talk about the importance of the intelligence authorization bill and what it means to the security of our country, but we have not been able to work out exactly how to proceed on that either.

Then on Wednesday, we had indicated we would go to the China PNTR issue. Indications had been that there would be resistance to moving forward on the motion to proceed, and I would have to file cloture on that, with that cloture motion then ripening on Friday. So we would go ahead and go to that and get over the first hurdle in being able to complete the China trade legislation when we come back in September.

We had hoped to go to the Executive Calendar and get some nominations completed this week and also consider some additional judges that might be reported from the Judiciary Committee during the week.

All of that right now is in abeyance. We have not been able to get an agreement on how to proceed at this time. I think that is unfortunate because we do have 4, 4½ days this week in which we need to make real progress on appropriations bills and other issues, as well as the China trade legislation.

If we cannot get an agreement here in the next couple of hours or so, then I will have to try to proceed to one of the appropriations bills and the intelligence authorization bill, and perhaps even file cloture on them. Both of those will then ripen on Wednesday. Of course, if cloture is obtained, then we will be on those bills, which will then get tangled up in the China permanent normal trade relations issue. So this is not a good way to proceed, but that may be our only alternative.

But I have talked to Senator DASCHLE this morning. I have talked to Senator HATCH. We will continue to work with Senators on both sides of the aisle to see if we can find a way to make some good progress this week, because this is the last week before the August recess, and it will have an effect on what we are able to do in September.

f

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise at this time to talk about our beloved friend, Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia. I had hoped to be able to make some further comments last week, after it fell my duty to come to the floor and announce his very untimely death, but I just could not do it because I was so emotionally disturbed and grieving over the loss of this good friend.

I guess maybe the week and the services in Georgia on Saturday have helped me come to peace with this very difficult loss and to say a fond farewell to my good friend from Georgia. But I wanted to speak now because I felt, even this morning, a void for this week; Paul will not be here. He will not be here saying, What can we do next? How can I help? He was willing to work with all of the Republicans and all of the Democrats, going over to the Democratic side of the aisle and seeking out Senator HARRY REID or Senator TORRICELLI, trying to find some way to make a bipartisan piece of legislation possible. So we will have a void this week.

But, as I was thinking about it a few moments ago, there will be a void forever in the Senate with the loss of Paul Coverdell because his was an unfinished symphony. A lot more beautiful sounds were going to come from that somewhat uncertain trumpet from Georgia.

Folks have talked about his flailing hands and his squeaky voice, but that is what really made Senator Coverdell all the more attractive. He was not always as smooth as some of us like to think we might be, but he was always effective. Maybe it was because of the way he presented his speeches and the way he came across in his daily relationships with all of us.

The Chaplain of the Senate, Lloyd Ogilvie, at the church services in memory of Paul Coverdell on Saturday, referred to him as a peacemaker. And maybe this is a good time of the year to be thinking about the beatitudes because I think it really did describe Paul. Even though he felt very strongly about the issues he believed in or that he was opposed to, he was always binding up everybody else's wounds. He would find a way to make peace and get results.

I thought the Chaplain's description of him as a peacemaker was apropos. When I did my Bible study this morning, I came to that particular passage, ''Blessed is the peacemaker.'' Again I thought, that is just one more message about Paul and the great job he did in the Senate.

I met Paul years ago actually, way back in the 1970s when there was a very fledgling Republican Party in Georgia. We didn't have much of a Republican Party at that time in my State, but we were beginning to make progress. Maybe Georgia was even a little bit behind us. I remember going down to Atlanta and then having to go to Albany, GA, to attend events, then back into Atlanta. It was one of those occasions where a number of Congressmen and Senators came in for a fly around the State, and then we all came back in for the big dinner. It was logistically hard to orchestrate. Then I finally met the maestro; the maestro was Paul Coverdell.

Typically, I learned later, it was the way he would work. He had five or six of us come in. We went to five or six different places in the State like spokes on a wheel. We came back. We had dinner. It was a very effective event. Everything worked like clockwork. It worked like clockwork because Paul Coverdell was making it happen.

In those days, as I recall, he was in the State legislature, in the State senate. They had three Republicans. He was the minority leader. They had a minority whip and they had a whipee. There were three of them. That is the way he used to describe his powerful role in the senate, although, as I came to find out a lot later, he was a very effective member of the State senate, working as always both sides of the aisle, even though he only had three in his party in the State senate at that time.

Of course, he went on to work in the Bush administration in the Peace Corps. I wasn't quite sure what that meant, but I am sure he did a great job at the Peace Corps. I remember then supporting him when he actually ran for the Senate in 1992. I wasn't that intimately involved in the campaign but knew him to be a good man. I remember making a pitch for him both here and in Georgia.

When I really got to know him was when he came to the Senate. Almost immediately he started throwing himself into the fray, whatever was going on. I remember we had the Clinton health care plan. I think he made 147 appearances in one State or another, on one occasion or another, against the Government takeover of health care. He felt passionately about it. He took off on the trail with Senator PHIL GRAMM and Senator JOHN MCCAIN. They had a lot to do with the eventual, and in my opinion, appropriate demise of that legislation. I learned that he wouldn't just talk a good game or wouldn't just give direction; he would put his body on the line. He would go anywhere, anytime to see that the message was delivered.

Immediately he started saying: If we are going to do this in a positive way, if we are going to be fighting this legislation, how are we going to get our message out? He would be persistent about it. He would follow you around and keep wanting to talk about it. I remember he actually instigated meetings, at that time between the Speaker of the House and me, first as whip and then as majority leader, in which he would get the two of us together. He would have charts. Here he is from Georgia in probably his fourth year in the Senate, and he is using charts to explain the situation to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader. Only we listened because he had thought about it; he was organized. He had some ideas.

I remember one occasion he said: You have to come to Atlanta.

I said: I don't want to come to Atlanta.

He said: Just come for lunch; Newt and I want to sit and talk with you.

So I flew down. We had lunch. He had charts and he had a video this time. He talked about how we should be planning our strategy. Then we flew back. I thought about that many times, in a way, the temerity of that. But that was Paul. Nobody objected. Nobody took it as a threat. Nobody worried he was stepping on their turf. And thank goodness, somebody was thinking and planning. That was Paul.

Then after that, of course, he got involved as a member of the leadership team. I really liked that because I can remember very early on I realized that if there was a task that needed to be performed that nobody else would do, I could call on Paul; he would be glad to do it. I can remember going down the leadership line: Would you have the time to do this? Do you have the staff to do this? It would come down to the third person. He always sat at the other end of the leadership table. I would get to Paul, having had three turndowns, and Paul would say: Sure, I'll do it.

Very quickly I developed the moniker for Paul of ''Mikey.'' I like to nickname Senators. Most of them wouldn't like for me to talk about it publicly. But Paul actually kind of liked being called Mikey. Mikey came from the television cereal commercial where the two kids are pushing a bowl of cereal back and forth saying: You eat it; no, you eat it. Finally, they push it to the third little boy and say: Give it to Mikey; he will try anything.

That was the way Paul was. When all the other great leaders of the Senate were not willing to take the time, not willing to do the dirty, difficult, time-consuming job, Mikey would do it. I remember every time I called him Mikey, he would break out in a big smile. Tricia, my wife, picked it up, too. We liked too talk to Nancy about how sorry we were to have kept him tied up a little extra, too, sometimes in the Senate. But Mikey had his work to do. So it was a very affectionate term I had for him, and it described him so perfectly.

He was not a funny, ha-ha sort of guy, but he was willing to laugh. He had a sense of humor. He was willing to laugh at himself, which really made him attractive. He was self-effacing. There was no grandeur there. He was, as PHIL GRAMM said in his remarks at the services Saturday—I believe it was PHIL—or as somebody said: An ordinary man with extraordinary talents. He was willing to work hard to make up for whatever he lacked in some other way. He surely was loyal. I never had to worry about anything I said or asked Paul to do being used in an inappropriate way against me or against anybody else. He would handle it properly. And he was sensitive. He was always sensitive: Did I do the right thing? Did this Senator react some uncertain way?

I remember asking him to come and help us on the floor on issues he cared about. He really cared about education. He wanted education savings accounts. He believed it would help parents with children in school. He believed it would help low-income parents have the ability to save just a little bit of their money, just a little bit to help their children with clothes or computers or tutoring. If we ever find a way to pass that legislation, instead of education savings accounts, it should be the Coverdell savings accounts. That would be an appropriate memorial and monument to Paul Coverdell. He believed in it. It wasn't a partisan political thing. It was something he thought would make a difference.

As for drugs, I remember him following me around in the well heckling me about the need to pay more attention to the drug running in the Gulf of Mexico area across the borders in the Southwest. The Senator from Arizona worked with him on that issue. I remember his commitment to trying to be helpful to the Government in Colombia to fight drug terrorism there. He was passionate about it because he felt it threatened our country, threatened our very sovereignty, and it threatened our children. Once again, as with education, he saw it in terms of what it was doing or could do to our children. Again, he was involved.

One of the last discussions I had with him was on the intelligence authorization bill. There is a provision in it which he didn't particularly like. He was determined to have a way to make his case on that. In his memory, we will make sure his case is made by Senator KYL, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator DEWINE, perhaps others. He really would dig into issues and make a difference.

I also called on him at times when there really was nobody else who could take the time to do the job.

He worked with us for a solid week on the floor on the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill. I came in one day and found that we had over 200 amendments pending. Somebody had to take the time to work with both sides to begin to get those amendments reduced, accepted, eliminated, withdrawn, or whatever. To his credit, Senator SPECTER said: I would like to have Paul spend time helping me with this.

Other leadership members were involved in other issues. I could not be here. Senator NICKLES could not be here. We had other things we had to do. Within a short period of time, the 200 became 50. Before the week was out, it was done.

Senator REID will tell you that Paul really made the difference. He didn't just hang out on this side of the aisle; he was rummaging around on the other side trying to see if we could work through it. I remember at the end of the week he was a little pale and, obviously, a little stressed. He came to my office and said: Boy, do I understand a little bit better what your job entails.

Well, he was able to do it because nobody felt threatened by Paul. He wasn't getting in my hair, stepping on Senator NICKLES' turf, or inappropriately shoving amendments away. He was working with everybody involved. Nobody got mad. Nobody got even. It is sort of a unique thing for a Senator to be able to do that.

So I guess I will be trying to find another ''Mikey.'' But I don't think there is one. And so as I thought about doing this speech, I tried to find some statement, some poem, something that would pay a final appropriate treatment to Senator Coverdell. I came across a passage from a poem, ''The Comfort of Friends,'' by William Penn.

He said:

They that love beyond the world
Cannot be separated by it.
Death cannot kill what never dies,
Nor can spirits ever be divided
That love and live in the same divine principle:
[Because that is] the root and record of their friendship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his comments and his very strong feelings about friends, people with whom he has worked.

I had a little different experience, I guess, with Paul Coverdell in that he was here when I came. So I was not in this business of leadership with him. Indeed, he took time to spend time with those of us who were new and to say: How can I help you? How can we work together? This was the kind of man that Paul Coverdell was. Certainly, he was an image that each of us should seek to perpetuate—that of caring, that of really feeling strongly about issues, and then, of course, being willing to do something about it. So I want to share with the leader my sorrow and sadness in not having Paul Coverdell here with us. I extend our condolences to his family.

f

GOALS FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to take some time today to talk about some of the things we are doing, some of the goals I hope we have, and the position we find ourselves in now as we come down to the last week prior to the August recess.

When we come back from the August recess, we will have, I suppose, about 20 working days to finish this 2-year session of Congress, the 106th session. We will have a great deal to do. As we go forward, as we take a look at the day-to-day tasks and activities that we have before us, I hope always that we look at where we want to go and what the goals are.

Sometimes I feel as if we get wrapped up in the day-to-day operations and the day-to-day problems and we lose sight

of where it is we want to be. But overall, as a Member of the Senate, or as an American citizen who is interested in Government, and as a voter, it seems to me that we ought to look at where we want to be over a period of time. Many things are involved, of course, in that. I think we have to take a look at where we are with respect to the Constitution. Most of us believe this Constitution has given us the greatest country in the world. This Constitution has given us more freedom, more opportunity, and more privileges than anywhere else in the world. Are we continuing to support that Constitution? Where will we be in 50 years? Where will we be in 10 years?

With regard to the role of the Federal Government, where do we want to be? What is our goal in terms of the future? What is the role of the Federal Government with regard to individual freedoms? What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to local government—the States and counties? Do we want a Federal Government that dominates all the things that we do? I don't believe so. So as we do each of these steps, it seems to me that it is appropriate to try to evaluate a little what we are doing and how that contributes to where we want to go. I know it is difficult. I think it is a challenge for each of us as we go about what we are doing.

I am, frankly, proud of what we have been able to do in this session. I am pleased about the direction the majority in the Senate has taken with regard to many of the issues; with regard to the balanced budget; with regard to Social Security; with regard to spending as it reflects Social Security and the changes that we have made to stabilize Social Security, making it strong; what we have done in terms of education; where we are in terms of the military and the security of this country, which is probably the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government.

So I think we ought to look at where we are. We are close now to finishing up. We have a number of things to do. But our determination, I believe, should be to stay within the budget we established. We have a budget program in which early this year we established spending limitations that we wanted to live within. It is difficult to do that. Everyone has a good idea as to where we can spend money. There are thousands of opportunities to spend money.

Frankly, when you have a surplus, spending becomes easier; it becomes something that everybody sort of gets into doing. We a have balanced budget. We maintain Social Security without spending Social Security dollars. We have been working on strengthening Medicare and pharmaceuticals, and we must continue to do that. We need to set up the technique for paying down the debt that we ought to pay. We have an obligation to pay that so our children don't have to. We are dedicated to returning the surplus back to the taxpayers, the people who have paid in the dollars. The surplus, indeed, should go back to them.

So it seems to me that we have a principle in our party, in this majority of the Senate, and in the Senate generally, for fiscal responsibility, for preserving Social Security, tax relief, and education. I am very proud of what we have done.

With regard to balancing the budget, actually in the last several years—it is the first time since the Eisenhower administration in 1957 that we balanced the budget with funds outside of Social Security. As the money comes in, of course, it comes in a unified budget. Social Security money has been borrowed and spent on programs other than Social Security. In 1995, when the Republicans took control of Congress, for the first time in 42 years, we began to balance the budget. I am pretty proud of that. I hope that we continue to be.

In terms of Social Security, of course, the first obligation is to set aside those dollars so that they are not spent on something else. Under our system, all that we can do with Social Security dollars is to put them into the trust fund, a Federal investment, which yields a relatively low return. We are seeking to take a portion of the Social Security funds now and let that account belong to the individual, so that when young people take their first job and have 12.5 percent of their earnings set aside, a portion of that can be in an account that belongs to them, which can be invested in the private sector at their direction, which can return a much higher yield so that over time there will be benefits for young people, probably leaving the ones 55 and older not doing anything at all and making sure they stay as they are.

Young people years from now will not have a return unless they do something different. We could increase taxes. Nobody is much interested in that. We could reduce benefits. That is not an answer. But we can increase the return on the trust funds. We are doing that.

We are funding education at a higher level than before, at a higher level than the administration requested. But probably more important is the effort made to return the decisions made with regard to elementary and secondary education back to the schools—closer to the school districts and closer to the school boards, rather than having those decisions being made in Washington. I can tell you that the needs in Pine Bluffs, WY, are much different from those in Pittsburgh.

You have to have some flexibility. We have the Ed-Flex bill so that those kinds of decisions can be made. I am pretty proud of that. I am very pleased with that. As the leader said, Senator Coverdell was the leader in doing those kinds of things.

As for strengthening the military, we are finding ourselves, of course, at a time when we don't have the cold war, where the inclination is for the emphasis to be off the military. This is not a simple world. We find ourselves at times needing a strong defense. We have a voluntary military, which we should have. But you have to make it relatively attractive for people to go into the military and stay there. You bring people into the military and train them to be pilots and mechanics; then they leave. We have done something there. We have increased the appropriations. We have increased, hopefully, the pay. Of course, if you are going to have an up-to-date military, there has to be science moving forward in new weaponry. We have to have new weapons. It is most difficult to do that.

This weekend I visited the Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, WY, one of the major bases. It is really one of the stable portions of our defense. We have to support that, of course.

Health care, naturally, is one of the things that is most important. We have moved to improve some of the payments that were made. We made some reductions in the balanced budget amendment in 1996. However, the administration has made those even larger than was intended. We have to go back and reclaim some of those payments—particularly for outpatient care and hospitals.

These are the things the majority party has worked toward and continues to work on.

We find ourselves now in the appropriations process. There are 13 appropriations bills to be passed. Hopefully, we will get 11 of them passed by the time this week is over. But it is very difficult. We have to challenge the administration. If they don't get their way—if they don't get the money they want in a particular appropriations—they are going to veto it. The President has threatened to shut down the Government, as he did before, and blame the Congress, of course. We have to keep that from happening. Nobody wants to shut down the Federal Government. We have different points of view. We have a different philosophy.

That is what this is all about. We debate those philosophies. Some people think government ought to be involved in all of life's activities. Others think there is no end to the amount of abuses that can take place. Others believe there ought to be some limit on the rules of the Federal Government. After we strengthen Medicare and pay down the debt, we ought to return additional money to those people who have made the payments.

With regard to paying down the debt, I am hopeful we can consider the proposition of a plan to do that. Again, our goal is to pay off the national debt of $6 trillion. It seems to me we ought to do it in an organized way—do it a little as a mortgage where you decide every year you are going to pay off some on the debt—and move toward doing that. If you keep saying, we will pay it down one of these days, it never happens. The interest on that debt becomes one of the largest items in the budget. We can fix that if we are willing to do it.

I am very proud of what we have accomplished in this Congress. I think we have established a philosophy and a direction of providing adequate programs for controlling the size and growth of expenditures of the Federal Government; doing those things that are necessary, yet moving many decisions back closer to the people and the local governments; taking care of the obligations we have, such as paying down the debt and returning those dollars.

One of the real controversies, of course, is going to be the tax relief that passed the Senate. The tax relief is in two areas that seem to be particularly appropriate—the marriage penalty tax, where two people who are working for *x* amount of dollars get married, continue to make the same amount of dollars, and then pay more taxes. It is a fairness issue. There is something wrong with that. We have changed that. The President has threatened to veto it.

The other one that needs to be changed, in my opinion—and the Presiding Officer has been a leader in this—is the death tax, the estate tax, the idea that when someone dies, up to 50 percent of their earnings throughout their life can be taken by the Federal Government.

The alternative, of course, is to not let death be a trigger for taxes but, rather, let those moneys be passed on to whomever they wish to pass them on to, and whenever things are disposed of and sold, there is a capital gains tax, of course, on the growth that has taken place. It seems to me that is a fairness issue.

That is where we are. Those are some of the exciting things that I think are happening, and things that fit in, I believe, with the goals most of us have in terms of moving forward with this Federal Government.

We now have a fairly short time to continue doing what has to be done. Appropriations have to be done. We need to continue with our tax reductions and continue with strengthening education. We need to continue in health care. We are on the road to doing that. I am very pleased with how we are doing it.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to take a few moments to reflect on some things you said and also on what the majority leader said a little while ago.

After our colleague Paul Coverdell died, I made a very brief statement on the floor. I knew I should speak briefly because it would be difficult to talk very long about Paul without becoming too emotional.

I think at a time when politics generally and politicians specifically are the subject of a lot of humor—they are denigrated because of cynicism about the political process, and in fact in some cases the denigration of some politicians is probably warranted—it is important for the American people to be reassured that there are some extraordinarily fine public servants who toil very hard on their behalf and who are responsible for whatever good comes out of these institutions—the House and the Senate.

Paul Coverdell was such a man. All of us who have spoken about him have shared with our colleagues and with the American people the same general notion that it is amazing what you can do if you are willing to let others take the credit for it. That was Paul Coverdell—self-effacing, very hard working, totally trustworthy and honest. Everyone could rely upon him to do the things that had to be done without fear he would in any way attempt to take advantage of any situation. He was as solid as a rock and a very important part of this institution—someone who really helped to make it run, and run in a good way.

I am sure my constituents in Arizona for the most part are unaware of Senator Coverdell, but they and others all around this country need to know how sorely he will be missed—not only personally but professionally—and how important a contribution he made to this country. There are truly some wonderful public servants, and Paul Coverdell was one of the best.

f

CONCERNS OF ARIZONA CONSTITUENTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when I was in Arizona this weekend, there were three things that seemed to come up frequently. One, of course, was the Vice Presidential selection of Governor Bush for the Republican nomination this fall. The other two subjects were the issues of tax relief, and I will briefly discuss that, and missile defense, which I will add to the mix, to share some of my constituents' concerns.

On the matter of Vice President, obviously, that is a subject of which Governor Bush will speak today or tomorrow, perhaps. Those on the Republican side will be, I am sure, very supportive. If it is former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, I think we will be especially pleased. I can't think of anyone who could make a better contribution, not only to the ticket but also to a future Republican administration, than Dick Cheney. He is from the Presiding Officer's State of Wyoming. He represents the kind of values that both the Presiding Officer and others from that great State represent: Straightforwardness, plain-spokenness, honesty, directness, a good strong sense of values, a willingness to do the hard work without having to take a lot of the credit, traits we treasure in someone such as Senator Paul Coverdell, and which Dick Cheney would certainly bring to the job. His experience and the great respect which people not only in this country but around the world have for Dick Cheney would serve the ticket well. I am not attempting to influence Governor Bush in any way, but if his choice is Dick Cheney, there couldn't be a better choice.

Now the other two subjects my constituents raised this past weekend. I was astounded that these were the two things they wanted to talk about: The tax relief that the Republican Congress continues to pass, and pass on to the President; and, secondly, the matter of missile defense, which I will get to in a moment.

I was amused to hear the Democratic candidate for President talk about a do-nothing Congress. This is rather strange, considering the fact that we have passed over and over and over legislation to help the American people, particularly to relieve them of some of the tax burden which imposes upon them an extra burden that they need not bear and that is inhibitive of future economic growth.

I am surprised that a Congress which has been so active—and, indeed, President Clinton has criticized us for being so active in this regard—would be accused then of being ''do-nothing.'' In truth, it is not the Congress that isn't willing to do these things; it is the Clinton-Gore administration that is unwilling to do these things.

Let me give some cases in point. We passed the estate tax relief about which the Presiding Officer talked. It passed overwhelmingly in both bodies, with bipartisan support. But the Clinton-Gore administration says it will veto this tax relief. We passed the marriage penalty, something that President Clinton said, in his State of the Union speech, was a top priority for him. He says he will veto that legislation. We can pass all of these things, but we can't get them into law unless the President signs them. We are doing our best in the Congress. It is now up to the President.

He did sign one thing that we passed this year. The Social Security earnings limitation was finally repealed. That was an important part of tax relief for an important part of my constituency, our senior citizens. There is more work to do there.

We want to also repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security which was imposed by the Clinton administration and the Democratic Congress when it controlled the House and the Senate, and Vice President GORE is always proud to remind everyone that he had to cast the deciding vote. This was the 1993 tax increase which, among other things, imposes a tax rate of up to 85 percent on the Social Security earnings of our senior citizens. This is

wrong and it ought to be repealed. If and when we do it, I will call upon the President to sign that.

We will probably send to him a repeal of the Spanish-American War era telephone tax. I think we can safely do this. The war has been over now for some time. We don't need to fund the Spanish-American War anymore. Like many other taxes and programs in Washington, once they are instituted, it is very difficult to ever get rid of them.

We are finally going to take the step to do that, as we did with the marriage penalty, as we did with the estate tax, as we did with the Social Security earnings limit. We are going to repeal this tax, as well, and call upon the President to sign this.

We have not been doing nothing. We have been doing something, something very worthwhile for the American people. I ask the President to reconsider his threat to veto these important tax cuts. Now, his argument is, maybe we can't afford it; it is a lot of money—this after receiving news that our tax surplus is going to be in the trillions of dollars—not billions, not hundreds of billions, but trillions of dollars. This is not a budget surplus; this is a tax surplus. It is a tax surplus because the taxes we have imposed on the American people bring in far more money than we should or can spend. I say ''can'' because, of course, Congress has the capacity to spend an unlimited amount of money.

We have set some standards in the Republican-controlled Congress. We have said we are not going to touch a dime of the Social Security surplus. The Social Security surplus is much larger than the non-Social Security surplus. This is the money that comes in as a result of the payment of our FICA taxes. Those are far greater than the need to pay the benefits under the Social Security program right now. And we are applying every dime of the Social Security surplus to a reduction of our Federal debt. That is why our Federal debt is being reduced so dramatically now.

The question is, What should be done with the non-Social Security surplus? It does not seem too much to me to return a dime, a dime on a dollar of that surplus, in the form of the marriage penalty relief and the estate tax relief to the American people. Under the most liberal interpretation of how much that would cost—and it is not nearly as much as this figure would suggest—but under the most liberal interpretation, it would be 10 cents on the dollar of the surplus we have.

It seems to me, since we are collecting more in taxes than we need—even after huge increases in spending in virtually every program we have—it is not too much to return 10 percent of this tax surplus to the American people. That is the magnitude of the issue. When President Clinton says it costs too much, he is saying the Federal Government ought to spend that money, rather then allowing the American people to keep this 10 cents on the dollar. That is arrogance of the first magnitude. That was one of the concerns my constituents presented to me this week.

The other had to do with missile defense. My constituents understand the need to protect America. They understand that Secretary Cohen has said we have a threat from North Korea, from Iran. There will be a threat from Iran; certainly China has been rattling its sabers these days. They understand that there is no way we can prevent an attacking missile from landing on the United States today and that it will be at least 5 years before we can do that if we proceed as rapidly as we possibly can. They are anxious we get on with the job of getting a missile defense program in place to protect the American people and to prevent other countries from blackmailing the United States from being involved in issues around the world in which we know we need to be involved.

This last weekend, there was a successful test—it didn't get much publicity—of the Patriot missile against a cruise missile target. This is another important component of missile defense. The last national missile defense test was a failure. From that, many people have said they conclude that there can't possibly be a successful program and we ought to just pack up and go home, ignoring the fact that the threat exists; also, Mr. President, ignoring something else. There is a phrase that has found its way into our jargon these days: ''It is not rocket science.'' Mr. President, this is rocket science, and it ain't easy. Sometimes it takes some failures in order to get to the successful conclusion of a program. There are over 20 tests in this particular program scheduled, most of them yet to be conducted. It is rocket science. It is hard. But we can do it. The people involved in the program are confident of that.

The failure in this last test, incidentally, was not a failure of any of the high technology. It was one of those quirks that can occur when something you have done hundreds of times before just did not happen to work on this particular occasion. But it was not a failure of the high-tech end of this missile defense program which we need to test to make sure it can work.

To my colleagues who may have been concerned as a result of the failure of this last test, I suggest to them we stay the course and continue the program as outlined by the Department of Defense, which I believe will be successful and will enable us to deploy a missile defense to protect the American people.

Final point. There are many who have urged the President to defer a decision, that he not make a decision. We have already made that decision when we passed the Missile Defense Act and President Clinton signed it into law. That decision was to deploy a national missile defense as soon as technologically feasible, and we believe it will be feasible. Therefore, we need to move forward with the program. That is why the President should not defer a decision. He should make a decision to go forward, but he should, of course, defer the specifics as to exactly what that program is for the next President to decide. That can be done, but there should be no backing away from going forward, and that is the decision the President should make.

Ultimately, of course, I think Governor Bush is correct. There will need to be not just one element of a system but, rather, the flexibility to deploy a multilayered defense for the American people which involves both land-based assets as well as sea-based assets and space-based assets. You need satellites to detect and track the trajectory of a missile. You can also be benefited by other assets in space. Certainly a missile defense would be augmented very well with sea-based capability, which could, under certain circumstances, even have a boost-phase intercept capability because of its proximity to the launching of the offensive missile.

All of this is well understood. I believe the Congress should stay the course and urge the administration to go forward with its decision. Of course, the details will be left to the next administration, but we should not signal we are not willing to protect the American people from missile attack.

Mr. President, you mentioned, in closing, we are hoping to take up the permanent trade relations with China toward the end of this week. I very strongly support the efforts by Senator THOMPSON to ensure that at the same time we are moving to open our trade with China, we make it clear to China that there are certain things which are inimical to peace around the world and certainly to our security. Included in that is China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver those weapons to other countries, countries of concern—the so-called rogue nations of Iran and Iraq and North Korea. It may also be proliferating to other countries that we would prefer not have large arsenals of these weapons.

The bottom line is that although we can and should move forward in developing closer and more robust trade with China, we cannot allow that kind of activity to suggest to China that we do not care about our own national security and about peace and stability and security in the world. That is why I think it is appropriate for us to also adopt the Thompson legislation which will make it clear that, for those who are involved in the proliferation, sanctions will result. I am hoping we can take that up at the end of this week.

Those are concerns that were expressed by my constituents this weekend. I told them I would share them with my colleagues. I have now done that and I appreciate the indulgence of the Presiding Officer, whose time I have been taking.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

VICE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION FOR DICK CHENEY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in the last part of our time here I want to follow up a little bit on your comments about the prospects for the Vice Presidential nomination for Dick Cheney. Partly, I guess, that is because it is a personal thing. As you mentioned, Dick Cheney is from Wyoming. Indeed, he is still a resident and now I understand he is voting in Wyoming. Certainly he is a friend. As a matter of fact, I took Dick Cheney's place in the House when he took the job as Secretary of Defense. I was more delighted about his promotion than anyone else, I suppose.

Aside from that, I guess I am really impressed with the opportunities that might bring about. Of course, it is up to the Governor, Governor Bush, to do whatever he chooses. He has not yet made an announcement. But it seems to me it is satisfying to think of someone being on that ticket who is just a basic person, who has demonstrated his ability to do so many things in government and outside of government. I think it is kind of unusual in today's political scene for it to be someone who just says it like it is, not the great spin.

I was thinking about that yesterday. I was hearing some things on the radio, trying to make one thing sound like another. That is not the way Dick Cheney does things. He just says it.

He has a great background in government. He worked in the White House, was Chief of Staff. By the way, I saw him at the airport in Denver. He seems to be doing well. Of course, he was in the House of Representatives, I think, for six terms—a number of terms, anyway. He rose to leadership there. He was selected then, as you know, to be Secretary of Defense. He did a super job in the gulf war and the activities there.

So it just seems to me he would bring to anyone's ticket this ideal of a strong, stable person, knowledgeable, ready to move in and do the kinds of things that are required of the leadership of this country.

I guess I am a cheerleader for Dick Cheney. Hopefully, we will have a chance to continue to do that over the next several months.

Mr. President, our time is nearly expired. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN HONOR OF PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 341, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 341) authorizing the printing of certain materials in honor of Paul Coverdell.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 341) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 341

Resolved, That the eulogies and other related materials concerning the Honorable Paul Coverdell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, be printed as a Senate Document.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I note, again, for all Senators, that this authorizes the printing of certain materials to honor Senator Paul Coverdell. We will designate a specific period of time later on this week so Senators who have not spoken will have an opportunity to do so. Of course, we will then pull together into a package all of the statements that have been made about Senator Coverdell for his widow, Nancy Coverdell.

f

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we have worked this morning, in some ways long distance because Senators who have been involved in these discussions are on their way back, and we have been trying to get agreements on how to proceed. We have not gotten it worked out yet. But in a full measure of precaution, because we want to make sure we are doing everything we can to complete our work this week, it is necessary for me to go ahead and move to call up an appropriations bill and the intelligence authorization bill and file cloture. They would then be ripened on Wednesday. We would be prepared to vote on cloture, if necessary, on Wednesday.

It is my hope that, through communications and meetings that will take place—perhaps later on this day or in the morning—we will be able to vitiate that because there is no need, really, to have to invoke cloture on the motions to proceed. But it is the only way I can begin the discussion and be assured that we get to the substance of these two bills some time this week.

f

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4871

Mr. LOTT. So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4871, the Treasury-Postal Service and general government appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

f

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment for 1 minute, and when the Senate reconvenes, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and the time for the two leaders be reserved.

The motion was agreed to, and at 3:21 p.m., the Senate adjourned until 3:22 p.m. the same day.

The Senate met at 3:22 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SUSAN COLLINS, a Senator from the State of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I note that we had hoped this week to complete action on some additional judicial nominations, to complete at least two appropriations bills and begin a third one, and have the first cloture vote on China PNTR. It is still our hope, but at this time, at least, there is objection from our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to proceeding on appropriations bills. We have a lot we can do this week, and I certainly hope we will do that. Under this action we have just taken, we can have some discussion by the chairman of the Treasury, Postal Service appropriations subcommittee. I see the manager, the chairman of the subcommittee, is here. I am sure he will want to make some comments and outline what is included in the bill.

f

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.R. 4871, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar number 704, H.R. 4871, a Bill Making Appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Trent Lott, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Pat Roberts, Richard G. Lugar, Jesse Helms, Jeff Sessions, Larry E. Craig, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, Don Nickles, Strom Thurmond, Michael Crapo, Mitch McConnell, Fred Thompson, Judd Gregg, and Ted Stevens.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I repeat my hope that we will be able to work out an agreement on how to proceed and that a vote on the cloture motion will not be necessary on Wednesday morning. But until we can get that done, we need to get the proceedings started. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

f

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we also need to get the intelligence authorization bill done this week. I don't think it will take that long to complete it, although I suspect there are at least a couple issues that will have to be debated and voted on. I had the impression maybe half a day or a night would be all that would be necessary to complete this. I am hoping maybe sometime even Thursday we might complete it, and before, if possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 654, S. 2507, the intelligence authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I say to my friend, the majority leader, on the minority side we also want to move on. We think there is a lot of work that could be done and should be done. For example, on Friday, with the energy and water appropriations bill, there was a provision in there that is very objectionable to a number of people on this side of the aisle, not the least of whom is the minority leader. The minority leader said take that out; it can be dealt with in conference. We think that is the case.

That is my bill. It is a very important bill, almost $23 billion. All of this money is discretionary money. It is a very important appropriation bill on which Senator DOMENICI and I have worked. We wish we could move that forward. We think it should move forward.

I also say to my friend, the majority leader, I think it is unfortunate that we have been unable today to deal with Senator HATCH. I understand there is a big celebration in Utah, Pioneer Day, on July 24, and he is committed to be there. I hope this evening or tomorrow we can sit down and talk. For example, I believe the judge's name is White, a Michigan judge, who has been before the committee and has not had a hearing; the nomination had been sent to the committee almost 1,200 days ago. In meeting with Senator HATCH and learning what his problems are, we will try to be as understanding as we can of his problems. I hope he will be as understanding of our problems as we are of his.

Senator DASCHLE and I said this on Thursday: We appreciate very much the work the majority leader has done. As powerful as he is, he still cannot overrule all the committee chairmen. They are here by virtue of their seniority. It makes it very tough to do that. We want to work to move this along. We believe the energy and water bill could move in a day or a day and a half.

Treasury-Postal: We don't believe that is a difficult bill. There are a couple touchy issues on that, but we believe we could work with the majority and move that along. We don't want it to appear that we are trying to hold things up. I think we have a pretty good record the past month or so of working with the leader.

In short, we hope in the meeting with Senator HATCH, either tonight or tomorrow, we will be in a position where we can expedite the rest of the work this week and move on to other things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I want to note that I did not move to proceed to the energy and water appropriations bill. I did that on purpose. I did it out of respect for the Democratic leader and the objection he has made to a particular section and the fact that it is obviously something very important to him and the Senators from North Dakota and South Dakota and other States.

But there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who actually support section 103 because of the impact this might have on the Missouri downriver in States such as Missouri, Illinois, and perhaps even, most importantly, as far as my own State of Mississippi. I talked to Senator DOMENICI and Senator DASCHLE this morning. I still hope we can find a way to resolve that. If that one issue can be resolved, I think that bill might take a couple hours and could be completed. I still have that on our list as one of the three bills we really must do this week.

With regard to the judges, I have made a commitment to try to continue to move judges who have been reported by the Judiciary Committee. I continue to urge the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to act on those judges who could be reported out. They did report out five judges last week, including a circuit judge from the State of Nevada who will wind up being on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in California, I guess, and so I think I have been keeping my word to try to move those.

I believe the Judiciary Committee is prepared to have a hearing or is having a hearing tomorrow and will move at least four more judges tomorrow. I think it would be unfortunate if those four got tangled up in these difficulties we are outlining now.

It is very hard for me to understand why these appropriations bills and this authorization bill, the intelligence authorization bill, would be held up over one circuit court judge or even two circuit court judges who may still be acted on or have hearings and be reported out. But the majority leader cannot just direct the Judiciary Committee or the chairman that he must report a specific judge. I think it is responsible for me to say: Report those judges where you can and that can be cleared and voted on. But I am not now in a position to guarantee that a specific one judge will be reported by the Judiciary Committee. We will keep working with the chairman of the committee, and hopefully some solution can be found. I think we can find it.

In the meantime, we are losing a day here. I hope we don't lose all day tomorrow. But that is our goal this week, to try to get some judges, try to do two or three appropriations bills, try to do intelligence authorization, and to begin debate on the China PNTR issue.

I guess there is no option for me at this time, though, but to move to proceed to the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I move to proceed to S. 2507, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar number 654, S. 2507, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001:

Trent Lott, Richard Shelby, Connie Mack, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Michael D. Crapo, Rick Santorum, Wayne Allard, Judd Gregg, Christopher Bond, Conrad Burns, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, Robert F. Bennett, Orrin Hatch, Pat Roberts, and Fred Thompson.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, this cloture vote will occur on Wednesday, unless we are already in a post cloture situation on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, or unless, of course, we have done away with the procedure and found a way to go directly to the substance of the bill. And, again, I hope we can do that.

I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before the leader leaves the floor, I want to say very quickly—and we need not discuss the issue of judges—this Senate really did well last week. Around the country, there were a series of editorials that were supportive of what the Senate did regarding the appellate judge; they were all positive for the majority and minority. That was a good move.

One reason, as I indicated, is that one of the Senators is upset because his judge is taking some 1,200 days before a hearing. Also, we recognize that the number of judges approved, while we have done quite well in the last few weeks, is still way behind what it should be.

I wanted to direct a question to the majority leader. Are we still going to have a vote at 6 o'clock? We are getting telephone calls in both Cloakrooms.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we could manufacture a vote, as the Senator knows, and force that vote. But in light of all that is going on, I don't see that it would serve any purpose other than sort of a bed check vote. It had been my intent to have votes on amendments to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill, but that is not possible. I think since we have had to take this action and file cloture, we should announce that there will not be a recorded vote or votes tonight at 6 o'clock.

The next opportunity to vote, I presume, will possibly be in the morning. I hope we can begin to make progress in some way during the day today, or early tomorrow, so votes can be held, if necessary, before the luncheon, or immediately thereafter.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I want the RECORD to reflect that during the past week, on Mondays—last Monday, we had lots and lots of votes. The preceding Friday, we had lots and lots of votes. If the public is looking at the number of votes cast, we are doing pretty well.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I don't know what the number was, but I think on Thursday, Friday, Monday, and Tuesday of last week and the previous week, we probably cast at least 20, 25 votes—maybe 30. So we certainly are turning out votes and getting our work done. We had a very good week last week and the week before. I hope we are going to have one yet this week. We are just not ready to make a lot of progress today.

f

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect amounts provided for an earned income credit (EIC) compliance initiative.

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	$541,593,000,000	$554,214,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	869,380,000,000	895,988,000,000
Adjustments:		
General purpose discretionary	+145,000,000	+146,000,000
Highways		
Mass transit		
Mandatory		
Total	+145,000,000	+146,000,000
Revised Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	541,738,000,000	554,360,000,000
Highways		26,920,000,000
Mass transit		4,639,000,000
Mandatory	327,787,000,000	310,215,000,000
Total	869,525,000,000	896,134,000,000

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 budget aggregates, pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Surplus
Current Allocation: Budget Resolution	$1,467,698,000,000	$1,452,935,000,000	$50,265,000,000
Adjustments: EIC compliance initiative	+145,000,000	+146,000,000	−146,000,000
Revised Allocation: Budget Resolution	1,467,843,000,000	1,453,081,000,000	50,119,000,000

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago Friday, Saturday, Sunday and today.

July 21: Benjamin Brown, 42, Gary, IN; Howard Brumskill, 23, Philadelphia, PA; Preston Butler, 18, Philadelphia, PA; Jennifer Casals, 57, Miami-Dade County, FL; Steven Cooks, 27, Memphis, TN; Shena Counts, 13, Baltimore, MD; Ronnie Loundon, 25, Nashville, TN; Calvin Maclin, 42, Detroit, MI; Kevin McCarthy, 29, Philadelphia, PA; Marc Mull, 19, Chicago, IL; Tavon Price, 21, Baltimore, MD; Jessica Roman, 56, Miami-Dade County, FL; Amanda Snow, 31, Houston, TX; Unidentified male, 15, Chicago, IL.

July 22: Chris Cantie, 26, Philadelphia, PA; Richard JOHNSON, 28, Chicago, IL; Ignacio Molina, 28, Houston, TX; Alfonse Roberts, 20, New Orleans, LA; Andrew Sandoval, Jr., 28, Denver, CO; Thomas Correll Walker, 22, Washington, DC; Howard Westly, 22, Philadelphia, PA; Michael R. Williamson, 50, New Orleans, LA; Peter Sao Xiong, 18, St. Paul, MN; Unidentified male, 16, Portland, OR.

July 23: Alva Anglin, 73, Memphis, TN; Jerome Cole, 25, Nashville, TN; Kewon Core, 22, Chicago, IL; Ronald Gates, 30, Chicago, IL; Marcos Guerra, 27, Houston, TX; Leon Hunter, 26, Detroit, MI; Luther Johnson, 21, Philadelphia, PA; Darroll Love, Washington, DC; Chelsea Martin, San Francisco, CA; Keila McDonald, 20, Oakland, CA; Khorosh Merrikh, 24, Houston, TX; Kimberly D. Price, 33, Oklahoma City, OK; Gerard Ouriel Robinson, 20, Washington, DC.

July 24: Tyrone Blackwell, 20, Baltimore, MD; Billy Gissendanner, 30, Detroit, MI; Lorena Gonzalez, 38, Fontana, CA; Raphael Gonzalez, 57, Miami-Dade County, FL; Tyrone Green, 24, Baltimore, MD; David Rivera, 15, El Paso, TX; Sammie Simpkins, 50, Washington, DC; Ernest White, 20, Knoxville, TN; Anthony Wilson, 29, Chicago, IL.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned was 38-year-old Lorena Gonzalez of Fontana, California. Lorena was shot and killed one year ago today in front of her 2-year-old son by a man who robbed her of a mere three dollars while she was waiting in a parking lot for her husband to return from a nearby store.

Another gun violence victim, 29-year-old Anthony Wilson, was shot and killed one year ago today in a drive-by shooting in front of his home on the south side of Chicago.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The time has come to enact sensible gun legislation. The deaths of Lorena and Anthony are a reminder to all of us that we need to act now.

f

CHIROPRACTIC BENEFIT FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for a provision included in the House-passed Department of Defense (DOD) Authorization bill which provides a permanent chiropractic benefit to all active military personnel. Iowans have a long history of support for the chiropractic profession. In fact, the nation's oldest institution of higher chiropractic learning—Palmer College—is located in Davenport, Iowa.

I am pleased that both the House and Senate have included provisions in their respective DOD authorization bills which expand access to chiropractic services for members of the military. These provisions follow on the heels of a multi-year pilot program enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. The pilot program demonstrated that military personnel who received chiropractic care had higher levels of satisfaction with the care they received as compared to personnel who only received traditional medical care. Furthermore, the pilot project demonstrated that chiropractic care would reduce hospitalization, return injured patients to work more quickly, and would result in a net savings to the Department of Defense in excess of $25 million annually.

The Defense Authorization Act passed by the House of Representatives begins the process of fully integrating chiropractic care into the military health care system on a direct access basis. The Senate-passed bill, however, limits chiropractic care through a medical gatekeeper. Direct access to chiropractic care would expedite the delivery of chiropractic care to those patients most in need of services and would free up existing health care providers to concentrate their time and efforts in other areas requiring attention. Therefore, I join the chiropractic profession in asking the conferees of the DOD Authorization legislation to accept the House-passed provision and provide direct access to chiropractic services to all active military personnel.

f

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a former member of this body, Senator Edward W. Brooke. Senator Brooke has served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as both a Massachusetts Attorney General and United States Senator. Recently, I had the privilege of attending the dedication of the New Chardon Street Courthouse in Boston on June 20th, named in honor of Senator Brooke. Given the former Senator's prestigious record of service to both the citizens of Massachusetts and the Nation, it is fitting that this honor be bestowed upon him.

During his distinguished career which spanned the course of two decades, Senator Brooke earned the prominent distinction of being the first African-American directly elected to both a State Attorney General position and the United States Senate. While in each office, Senator Brooke spearheaded efforts to achieve civil rights and equality for women, minorities, and the poor.

Elected Massachusetts Attorney General in 1962, Senator Brooke earned his reputation as a crime-fighter through his extensive work with the newly created Massachusetts Crime Commission. He actively combated corruption in State government and singlehandedly organized and completed the extensive investigation of the infamous ''Boston Strangler'' homicides.

Only 4 years later, he became the first African-American Senator to serve since Reconstruction, and the first and only to be re-elected. During his two terms in Congress, Senator Brooke figured prominently into all aspects of the Senate. He vigorously opposed escalation of the Vietnam war and supported arms control treaties like the MIRV and ABM proposals that would eventually become the catalysts in establishing improved relations and recognizing the People's Republic of China. Senator Brooke was the first Republican Senator to call for President Nixon's resignation after the Watergate scandal. In addition, Senator Brooke was a tireless champion of the poor. He authored the ''Brooke amendment,'' which provided that public housing tenants pay no more than one-fourth of their income for housing.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Brooke's comments at the New Chardon Street Courthouse dedication ceremony be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD W. BROOKE COURTHOUSE DEDICATION

I respectfully ask that you join me in a moment of silence in memory of a dear and cherished friend, Roger H. Woodworth, a former Massachusetts Assistant Attorney General, who served his country in war, and his fellow man all the days of his life.

I could not write nor can I speak words which adequately convey the appreciation of my wife, Anne, our daughters, son, grandchildren and all of our family for this splendid recognition. It is, of course, an honor for me, but, more importantly, the naming of this courthouse also recognizes the exemplary service of the men and women with whom I was privileged to work in the Boston Finance Commission, the Office of the Attorney General and in the United States Senate.

I am particularly grateful to Senator Brian Lees, Governor Paul Cellucci, Senate President Thomas Birmingham, House Speaker Thomas Finneran, the 200 members of the Great and General Court, and all of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for this honor.

I also want to thank Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood, for their architectural vision and creativity and the contractors O'Connor & Dimeo & O'Connor for building this magnificent structure.

Thanks also go to those who labor within, Chief Justice Barbara Dortch-Okara, the judges who dispense justice, clerks, administrators, and especially those who secure and maintain this courthouse and who bear the responsibility for present and future safety, cleanliness and decorum.

I extend my warmest appreciation to all who have organized and participated in this ceremony, the clergy, the officials, the speakers, the singers, the band, the color guard, the police, the Metropolitan District Commissioner David Balfour and the dedication committee, and to all of you who have come from Maine to California, from the Berkshires to the Cape and Islands, and from the Caribbean.

My association with Massachusetts began on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941, when I received a telegram from the United States Army ordering me to report to the 366th Infantry Combat Regiment at Fort Devens, in Ayer, Massachusetts. It was to be the first time for me to set foot on Massachusetts soil.

I could not possibly have foreseen that after the war I would have returned to Massachusetts to study law at the Boston University School of Law, to practice law in Roxbury and in Boston and to serve in public office. Nor could I have known that the people of Massachusetts were to give me the greatest opportunities and challenges of my life.

This building and its location have special meaning for me. In my law school days I lived a stone's throw away, at 98 Chamber Street in the West End of Boston before I moved to Roxbury to live with my old Army buddy Al Brothers and his wife, Edith. I attended classes at Boston University Law School at 11 Ashburton Place, a few blocks up the hill from here and studied contract and constitutional law on a bench in the Boston Commons just behind the Robert Gould Shaw Monument. I practically boarded at Durgin Park, over there, near Faneuil Hall, where the servings of pot roast, mashed potatoes and cornbread were generous and the price was right.

Later, after practicing law on Humbolt Avenue in Roxbury, I practiced law in Pemberton Square across the street from the old Boston Municipal Court just up the hill. It was during those days that I practiced in the same probate, land and juvenile, now the more civilly named family court, all now in this new building. And, at first, to make a living, I searched many a title in the musty volumes upstairs in the office of the old Suffolk County Registry of Deeds, Later, I worked in the offices of the Boston Finance Commission, just down the street from the Parker House, and still later, in the Office of the Attorney General in the old bullfinch State House, all within a short walking distance of this new building.

My relationship with Boston has now come full circle within the naming of this courthouse and my involvement in the restoration of another old Bullfinch Building built in 1804 at the corner of Beacon and Park Streets. It was also in Boston close by, where my fraternity, Alpha Phi Alpha, inducted a

young Boston University Divinity School student named Martin Luther King.

In order to be on time for this ceremony, Anne and I came to Boston last Friday morning, which enabled me to lunch at the famous Doyle's Pub in Jamaica Plains with some of the retired newspapermen of yesteryears. Having been married 21 years, and still being young lovers and on Saturday Anne and I strolled hand-in-had Saturday through the historic Boston Commons, founded in 1634, and the beautiful Boston Gardens with its spectacular beds of flowers. We walked over the footbridge and looked down at the ducks and the swan boats. We later ate streamed mussels and broiled bluefish at Legal Seafoods just behind the Four Seasons Hotel. We continued our walk up Newbury and Boylston Streets, miraculously without incurring major debt, and at noon, sat in silence, prayed and listened to the beautiful rehearsal music of the choir of Trinity Church in old Copley Square where I worshipped years ago, heard the wonderful sermons of the rector, Dr. Theodore Ferris, and where my daughters were confirmed. I shall always remember election night 1966 when I received my first congratulatory telegram. It simply read: ''Hallelujah'' and was signed Ted Ferris.

It has been said that this may well be the first state courthouse named for an African-American and perhaps the only one in Massachusetts named for a living person. If true, both are sad commentaries. It would be shameful with all of the qualified and talented African-American men and women in this country, that it has taken 137 years since the Emancipation Proclamation to give such recognition. And as for the recognition of the living versus the dead, I, of course, vote for the living.

In fact, in the present case, the new name of this building was approved by the Massachusetts legislature on a budget bill to which it had been attached by Senate President Birmingham and Senate Minority Leader Lees, and signed into law by Governor Cellucci on November 22, 1999. The Governor is his wisdom, wanting to have an outdoor ceremony and being assured of perfect weather, set the date for this dedication ceremony for June 20th, 2000. Of course, politicians always claim credit for things with which they had nothing whatsoever to do. So with due respect, Governor Cellucci, I give credit for the beautiful weather to Richard Winkleman, a dear friend who goes to church every day of his life, and who has been praying continually for good weather for today. During the interim between the passage and the signing of the budget bill, when told that this might be the first for a living person, my response was, ''Well, you'd better hurry up or your record may stay in tact.''

Today is not one to dwell on criticism of the past no matter how valid that criticism may be. It is a day of joy, a day of celebration and a day of acknowledgement and appreciation for what has been accomplished. It is also a day for a commitment to accelerate our efforts for greater progress in the present and in the future. Massachusetts Governors Michael Dukakis, William Weld and Paul Cellucci are to be commended for having appointed many highly-qualified women, African-Americans, Jews and representatives of other minorities to the judiciary and elsewhere in their administrations. I trust that successor governors will continue that record including the appointment of Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans. Like justice, appointments and recognition should be racial and gender-blind, and I respectfully urge other states across the country to follow the example set by this Governor, this legislative body, and the citizens of Massachusetts.

As we look to the future and the generations to come who will avail themselves of equal justice under law in this gleaming symbol of civil society, let us all pledge to work for a nation in which barriers of race, religion and ethnic origin do not stand in the way of achievement or recognition, a nation that continues to strike down the barriers that make us weak and lives up to the noble principle that make us strong. In the strength of unity and purpose may we recall the words of that old hymn:

''God of justice save the people from the wars of race and creed, from the strife of class and friction make our nation free indeed.

''Keep her faith in simple manhood, stronger than when she began, till she finds her full fruition in the brotherhood of man.''

For this high honor, thanks be to Almighty God and the people of Massachusetts.

f

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act and urge that it be brought to the Senate floor for a vote.

Sadly, breast and cervical cancer will afflict nearly 200,000 women this year, and take the lives of more than 45,000. Women in every State and every community in the country are today facing the daunting challenge of overcoming these diseases. They are not strangers; they are our sisters, mothers, aunts, and grandmothers. They are people we love and care about.

The statistics are disturbing. The family stories are sobering. But let us find hope in the strides that we have made so far. In 1991, Congress created the Early Detection Program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which provided low-income, uninsured women with breast and cervical cancer screening services. It was a positive first step toward ensuring that every woman, regardless of her annual income and insurance situation, could request a screening for breast and cervical cancer. I wholeheartedly support the program, and I know many of my colleagues do as well.

However, just as critical as guaranteeing universal access to cancer screening is the need to provide treatment options following a diagnosis of cancer. While the CDC Early Detection Program supplies participating women with an evaluation, it offers nothing in the way of treatment should that evaluation reveal cancer. The very same women who are not expected to pay for a screening are somehow expected to finance their own treatment program. It simply does not make sense.

We must, therefore, draw a line from A to B, from screening to treatment. The Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, a bill I am pleased to cosponsor, does just that. It gives States the option of offering Medicaid coverage to women that participated in the CDC Early Detection Program and were diagnosed as having breast or cervical cancer. In so doing, it provides a much-needed complement to the Early Detection Program.

We have broad bipartisan support in the Senate to pass this bill. Nearly 80 Senators have cosponsored it. The program was included in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget. But we need a vote.

As time in this Congressional term wanes, we are increasingly forced to make difficult choices about which bills to address. But I believe this bill must be a top priority. It is unacceptable that women who are diagnosed with cancer often go without life-saving treatment simply because they cannot afford it. Congress has the responsibility to act quickly on this issue.

In the spirit of the CDC Early Detection program, which is approaching its 10th anniversary, I urge the leadership to bring S. 662 to the floor as soon as possible, and advance America's fight against breast and cervical cancer.

f

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 21, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,667,708,257,883.47 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-seven billion, seven hundred eight million, two hundred fifty-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-seven cents).

One year ago, July 21, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,630,350,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred thirty billion, three hundred fifty million).

Five years ago, July 21, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,936,736,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred thirty-six billion, seven hundred thirty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 21, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $533,588,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-three billion, five hundred eighty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,134,120,257,883.47 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, one hundred twenty million, two hundred fifty-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

f

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF EXPO 2000, A BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY MARKETPLACE

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the Houston Minority Business Council and the other groups and individuals who are now preparing for ''EXPO 2000, a Business Opportunity Marketplace,'' to be held on August 31, 2000, in the George R. Brown Convention Center in Houston, Texas. This annual event is Texas' largest minority business trade fair and offers a meeting ground for corporations seeking to identify experienced minority entrepreneurs.

Over the last decade, the number of minority owned businesses grew in the

U.S. by an impressive 168 percent. These businesses generate half a trillion dollars in revenue and employ nearly four million workers. This success has been in large measure due to the efforts of groups like the Houston Minority Business Council and the dedicated individuals throughout Texas and this nation who seek to expand economic opportunities for all Americans.

The EXPO has been an outstanding example of such efforts, and has opened the doors of the marketplace by successfully pairing minority business owners with representatives from more than 220 local and national companies. The event provides these minority entrepreneurs with direct marketing opportunities with corporations, government agencies and educational and financial institutions that need capable contractors to support their missions. The EXPO has produced real results, with two thirds of participants reporting having obtained contracts for as much as two million dollars within a year of the event.

I have worked hard in the U.S. Senate to build upon efforts like this to expand Federal contracting opportunities to small and disadvantaged business entrepreneurs. I have helped lead the efforts to defend programs such as the 8 (a) Federal business development program, worked to curb the ''bundling'' of Federal contracts that hurt small businesses, and I have served as a champion of Small Business Development Centers, which assist small businesses in getting the capital and assistance needed to get started and expand.

I again commend the organizers, supporters, and participants of EXPO 2000. These fine men and women represent the best of Texas' entrepreneurial, hard-working and neighborly spirit. I wish them all much future success, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to ensure that all Americans share in the fruits of our economic prosperity.●

f

A TRIBUTE TO BERNIE WHITEBEAR

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is with great admiration that I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Bernie Whitebear, of Seattle, Washington, who passed away at the age of 62 on Sunday, July 16, 2000.

A long-standing advocate and leader in the fight for tribal self-determination, Bernie Whitebear was an outstanding role-model for tribal and non-tribal people alike. Known for his vision, humor and commitment, he lives on in the minds and hearts of everyone who knew him.

Bernie Whitebear was born on September 27, 1937 on the Colville Indian Reservation in Eastern Washington. Born into a large family, Bernie grew up confronting many of the barriers facing reservation children, including poverty and discrimination.

As an adult, he moved to Seattle, attended the University of Washington and worked as an engineer for Boeing. He later joined the Army as a paratrooper in the 101st Airborne Division and served as a Green Beret.

During the activism of the late 1960's, Bernie Whitebear emerged as one of the central tribal leaders in the Pacific Northwest and was a tireless advocate for American Indian recognition and empowerment. We often remember his social action, seen through his leadership in the ''invasion'' of Fort Lawton in Seattle in 1970. Bernie and others occupied the Fort Lawton property after plans were announced to list the Fort as surplus property for the city to designate as a park. He felt local tribes had a historic right to the land, which could be better used as a central service base for Seattle's largely unserved urban Indian population.

The 3-month occupation, civil arrests and resulting media attention prompted Congress to order the city of Seattle to negotiate a settlement, which included a 99-year lease on a 20-acre parcel for Whitebear's group. The settlement provided space for construction of the Daybreak Star Art Center, which currently stands in Discovery Park.

I want to share with the Senate one of my favorite memories of Bernie Whitebear. Bernie had invited me to attend the Mini-Pow Wow in my state on February 7, 1998. He asked me to stop by to talk about the People's Lodge, to see the artwork, and to have a quick look at some of the traditional dances. I told Bernie I would stop by, but that I only had a short while because I had a lot of events I needed to attend that day.

I remember when I arrived at the University of Washington Bernie welcomed me with his big bright smile and an outstretched hand. We watched some of the traditional dances, and then I realized that if I didn't leave soon I would be late for my next event. It was one of those days when I was trying to meet as many people as possible. Well Bernie didn't let me just meet the people at the Mini-Pow Wow, he made me stay and understand them. He started by introducing me to everyone in the room.

Then Bernie leaned over to me and explained that it was customary for a visiting United States Senator to move to the front of the dancing group. You know, it was one of the many Native American traditions Bernie told me about that always sounded a little invented to me. Like another old tradition he told me about: That anytime a U.S. Senator stepped foot in Discovery Park he or she had to pay a visit to the Daybreak Star Center. Well there was Bernie asking me to move to the front, and who could say no to Bernie?

He had his arm around me. He was leading me to the front. Everyone was watching, and I went along. The next thing I knew, I was leading about 300 people in a tribal dance. Even though I was not born to be a dancer and I certainly didn't know that particular dance, Bernie made it easy. He had such an open, loving, and compassionate nature that you just couldn't help but feel a part of it. As I looked around, people were smiling, and there was a real sense of comradery and respect shared by everyone in the room. About two hours later, as the event was winding down, I said goodbye to Bernie, and I got into my car.

As I drove away, I realized what Bernie had really done for me that day. He helped me understand Native American cultures from the inside, not as someone sitting on the sidelines watching, but as someone in the middle of the festivities. I felt the sense of community and respect that Bernie was always so proud of. Anyone can talk about those qualities and traditions, but Bernie let me experience them, and he did it with a big grin on his face. I know I'm better off for that experience.

That day shows just how effective Bernie was at getting us to shed our expectations, to realize what we have in common, and to work together.

Throughout his life, Bernie used his own unique style and generous heart to accomplish many things. He founded the United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, which provides education and counseling resources for the estimated 25,000 American Indians in the Puget Sound area. Along with the Daybreak Center and the United Indians Foundation, he worked to sensitize Seattle police to urban Indian issues. Recognizing the persistent need for American Indian health services, he also helped create the Seattle Indian Health Board and later served as its first executive director.

For his many contributions, Bernie Whitebear was awarded numerous honors. In 1997, Governor Gary Locke named him a ''Citizen of the Decade.'' He recently received Seattle's Distinguished Citizen Medal. In 1998, the University of Washington gave him the Distinguished Alumnus of the Year Award. Bernie was a remarkable man with spirit and a warmth that touched everyone he encountered. My thoughts and sympathies are with all of Bernie's family and friends.

Bernie Whitebear acted as a beacon for compassion, cultural understanding and tribal sovereignty in the Puget Sound Region. His legacy is left in all of us who have tremendous respect for the history and cultures of the tribes, a history Bernie would draw us into, by his passion, by his words and by his deeds. I will miss him.●

f

TRIBUTE TO CARDINAL HILL REHABILITATION HOSPITAL

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the directors and staff of Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital in recognition of providing physical rehabilitation services for the past fifty years to the people of Kentucky.

Cardinal Hill Hospital treats more than 6,000 patients every year from virtually every county in the state. The

Hospital, beginning as a convalescent home for children with polio, has now developed into a leading physical rehabilitation center for Lexington and its region. This anniversary not only reaches a significant milestone, but marks a time for recognition and celebration.

Dedicated to treating children and adults, some of Cardinal Hill's patients have been treated for catastrophic accidents or disabling diseases like multiple sclerosis, spina bifida, or cerebral palsy. Two of the more publicized patients would include Missy Jenkins, survivor of the Paducah Heath High School Shooting and Palmer Harston, of Lexington, 2000 National Easter Seals Child Representative, that have been given care and treatment by Cardinal Hill Hospital. Cardinal Hill has provided for patients who have dealt with all kinds of tragedies, whether small or large.

Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital continues to display an unswerving commitment to the people of Kentucky and possesses the respect and gratitude of many in the community. The significant work accomplished at this hospital promises a successful future for the citizens of this state as they can be ensured that disabilities will be continued to be treated at Cardinal Hill.

I am certain that the legacy of dedication that Cardinal Hill Rehabilitation Hospital has left will carry on. Congratulations to the directors and staff of Cardinal Hill on 50 years of service to Kentucky. Best wishes for many more years of commitment, and know that your efforts to better the lives of those in the region will be felt for years to come. On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the United States Senate, thank you for giving so much of yourself for so many others.●

f

CITY KIDS WILDERNESS PROJECT

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, ''An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'' When our parents and grandparents told us that, they probably weren't talking about the problem of crime in America. But they might have been.

So many times in our debates, in the testimony given by experts from law-enforcement professionals to psychologists and social workers, the value of prevention—of keeping kids away from crime before they ever get into it—is clear and indisputable. And it is just as clear that one of the best ways to keep kids out of trouble is, simply, to give them something else to do.

Terrance Collier, a 13-year-old from Washington, DC, had something else to do this summer. In fact, he had a lot to do. Through a program called City Kids Wilderness Project, Terrance went to Wyoming, where he camped, cooked, helped with cleaning up, paddled a canoe, went rafting, made new friends and, in the process, learned about nature, himself, teamwork and responsibility.

Randy Luskey started City Kids Wilderness Project and continues to fund the program himself. A few years ago, Randy donated his Wyoming ranch to the kids. But, Randy is not just a blind donor. Randy leaves his own family in Colorado every year to actively participate with the kids in Jackson Hole.

Cathy Robillard takes time away from her home and family in Vermont every summer to work with the kids in Wyoming. She is the person that runs the nuts and bolts of the program and does so with a measure of care and discipline.

City Kids Wilderness Project is one of the best possible examples of time and money well spent. And it is an example that should be followed.

A lot of the participants get into City Kids Wilderness Project through Boys and Girls Clubs, the kind of partnership that gets the best out of both programs, the kind of partnership that has proven successful time and time again.

In debating funding for crime-prevention programs and public-private partnerships, we hear testimony from the experts and professionals, as we should, but we will never have a witness more important than 13-year-old Terrance Collier. Terrance found his time in Wyoming to be rewarding, it made a difference to him, he thought it was important and it kept him off the street.

Let's listen to that testimony, and let's thank the people like Randy Luskey and Cathy Robillard who are offering ''an ounce of prevention'' to kids like Terrance, brightening the promise of the future for all of us.●

f

TRIBUTE TO PAUL M. MONTRONE—NEW HAMPSHIRE BUSINESS IN THE ARTS LEADERSHIP AWARD WINNER

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Paul Montrone upon his recognition as the 2000 New Hampshire ''Business in the Arts-Leadership'' award winner.

In order for arts programs to run smoothly and efficiently, there must be a strong leader behind the operation. Paul has been instrumental in the development of the arts in New Hampshire for many years. He has been a leading figure in enhancing corporate and individual financial support both regionally and nationally, and has a demonstrated interest in improving the operation and effectiveness of arts organizations.

Paul's strong leadership has proven to be an effective model for others to follow. He gives generously of his time by serving on the boards of many nonprofit organizations such as the Wang Center in Boston and the New England Conservatory, and also serves as the president and CEO of the Metropolitan Opera. He personally assists the Mayer Arts Center at Phillips Exeter Academy which attracts visiting artists to display their work on campus and establish residencies and workshops in the surrounding community. He also supports the scholarship program at Phillips Exeter Academy, designed to help support gifted students pursue their dreams in the arts. His early and consistent support of the Music Hall in Portsmouth is yet another testament of his vision and long-term commitment to the community.

Without the support of generous financial donations, arts programs would suffer tremendously. Paul has long patronized arts organizations and has convinced major corporations to do the same through ''challenge'' grants. These grants are made at significant points of the fund drive, thereby motivating other potential donors to donate. His keen business skills are evident in the large amounts of financial support he earns for particular programs.

It is citizens like Paul who exemplify the importance of civic responsibility. His work in making the arts more accessible to the community is commendable. Without the support of such dedicated people like Paul, the arts would not be able to thrive in New Hampshire. It is an honor to serve him in the United States Senate.●

f

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF BEDFORD

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the town of Bedford on its 250th anniversary, an important and historic milestone in New Hampshire's history.

The town was incorporated on May 21, 1750. Once an unsettled wilderness located in the heart of New Hampshire, Bedford has grown into a booming residential and commercial community. Its close proximity to the center of Southern New Hampshire makes it very convenient for residents to commute to bigger cities like Manchester and Nashua. Bedford is a thriving small town with a strong commitment to family and community values, evidenced by a first-rate school system and active participation by many residents in civic groups such as the Rotary Club and the Lions Club.

The town has come together to celebrate its anniversary with year-long events, such as town picnics, exhibits and a parade marking the town's official birthday. A 250th anniversary ball is planned as the cumulation of the year's events. These celebrations strengthen town organizations' staying-power and provide an opportunity for residents to congregate and enjoy all the town has to offer. The overwhelming number of Bedford residents who attended these events is a testament to their commitment to town and civic affairs.

Slowly but surely, this quiet former farming town has seen tremendous commercial growth within the last 50 years. Bedford is now home to many small businesses and office parks, but has certainly not lost that small-town charm. With 16,500 citizens, it is easy

to meet familiar faces in passing. Although the town may be steadily expanding its collection of businesses, the residents have not let them overwhelm their beautiful scenic community.

Once again, I want to congratulate the town of Bedford on its 250th anniversary. Stable and secure communities such as Bedford are essentially the backbone of this great nation. It is an honor to serve its citizens in the United States Senate.●

f

TRIBUTE TO TOM SCHWIEGER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the outstanding leadership of Tom Schwieger, President and CEO of the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce. Tom's seventeen years of service have been marked by integrity, vision and dedication, earning him the respect and admiration of the people of New Hampshire.

During his tenure at the Manchester Chamber, Tom has initiated and overseen some of the most important revitalization projects of the last fifty years. He was the driving force behind the development of the Manchester Airport and the newly approved Civic Center. In 1998, as a testament to the success of Tom's efforts, Manchester was named the best small city in America in which to live.

When I speak with Tom, I am always left with the impression that he truly loves what he does. His energy and enthusiasm is contagious and Tom has assembled a very prestigious Board of Directors. As BJ Eckhardt of Business New Hampshire Magazine remarked, ''people are honored to serve on the board; no one says 'no' to Tom.''

In addition to his many professional achievements, Tom has served as a mentor and an inspiration to many members of the Chamber staff. Many current New Hampshire community leaders credit Tom with giving them their start and helping to shape their careers.

Walter Lippman once said, ''The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men, the conviction and the will to carry on.'' In his seventeen years at the Chamber, Tom has given the organization direction, drive, and a sense of mission. He has served with spirit and devotion, and his legacy will serve as an example to his successors for years to come.

Tom, it has been an honor and a pleasure to serve you in the United States Senate. I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors. May you always continue to inspire those around you.●

f

TRIBUTE TO SITESURFER PUBLISHING—NEW HAMPSHIRE ''BUSINESS IN THE ARTS'' AWARD WINNER

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Sitesurfer Publishing upon its recognition as a 2000 New Hampshire ''Business in the Arts'' award winner in the microenterprise category.

Sitesurfer Publishing has proven that a little bit of time and energy is all it takes to make a significant impact in the arts. This company has allowed such organizations as the Capitol Center for the Arts in Concord to become more competitive in today's high-tech world of on-line business. Sitesurfer created a website for the Capitol Center which resulted in thousands of dollars worth of contributions and tickets sold. This type of competitive edge has attracted worldwide visitors and increased the appeal of corporate sponsorship packages, proving to be the sort of revenue needed to continue the Capitol Center's many programs.

Sitesurfer has gone a step further in assuring the future of the Capitol Center's newest technology by providing the necessary hands-on training for the Center's staff to maintain and update the website, while still making itself available for support and hands-on work when it is needed. Sitesurfer understands the importance of making the arts accessible to others by providing memberships and complimentary tickets to their employees and clients.

Without the support of dedicated businesses, the arts would not be able to flourish in the state. Despite its small size, Sitesurfer Publishing has demonstrated that even small businesses can take an active role in the community not only by donating money, but by investing time and hard work into civic causes. Sitesurfer truly signifies the deep personal commitment of small businesses across the state to supporting the causes that make New Hampshire the place to call home. It is an honor to represent them in the United States Senate.●

f

TRIBUTE TO LOU SISSON—WAKEFIELD CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lou Sisson upon her recognition as the Wakefield Citizen of the Year by the Greater Wakefield Chamber of Commerce.

Lou's tireless efforts to better her community are truly inspirational in a time where civic duties are declining. Aside from her duties as owner of the Wakefield Inn, Lou has been an active member of the Lions Club, the Women's Club, the Heritage Commission and a founding member of the Wakefield Arts Club. Her long list of involvements are a testament to her strong dedication to the community and her commitment to making various events and programs available to all Wakefield citizens.

Lou's hard work on the Sidewalk Committee led to the construction of numerous sidewalks throughout downtown Wakefield, making the streets safer for pedestrians. She is also involved in a summer youth program which recently created a two-mile heritage trail that outlines information about the town's historic sites, providing educational and recreational opportunities for all town residents. Lou truly enjoys volunteering and cites the friendly, personable town atmosphere as the true motivation for her efforts.

It is citizens like Lou who make our communities stronger and exemplify what is good about America today. Lou's dedication to making her community a better place to live is commendable. It is truly an honor to serve her in the United States Senate.●

f

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. OBEY, as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

f

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–9937. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automatic rollover of involuntary cash-out'' (Rev. Rul. 2000–36) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9938. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidance on section 403(b) plans'' (Revenue Ruling 2000–35) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9939. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Default rollover of involuntary cash-out'' (Rev. Rul. 2000–36) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9940. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Retention of Income Tax Return Preparers' Signatures'' (RIN 1545–AW52) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9941. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Telefile Voice Signature Test'' (RIN 1545–AR97) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9942. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Center for Health Plans and Providers, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program: Medicare and Choice'' (RIN 0938–AI29) received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9943. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Commission, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–600, –700, and –800 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 2000–NM–209'' (RIN 2120–AA64 (2000–0376)) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9944. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Commission, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Class E Airspace; Oakley, KS; Docket No. 00–ACE–20 [7–14/7–17]'' (RIN 2120–AA66 (2000–0175)) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9945. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Crystal Falls and Republic, Michigan'' (MM Docket No. 98–128, RM–9308, RM–9385) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9946. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations, Las Vegas, Nevada'' (MM Docket No. 99–252, RM–9648) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9947. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of FM Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations Sulphur Bluff, Texas'' (MM Docket No. 99–287, RM–9712) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9948. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations, Reno Nevada'' (MM Docket No. 99–291, RM–9665) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9949. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Tallulah, Louisiana)'' (MM Docket No. 99–348; RM–9765) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9950. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Hemet, California)'' (MM Docket No. 99–349; RM–9766) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9951. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Simmesport, Louisiana)'' (MM Docket No. 99–350; RM–9769) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9952. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Holbrook, Arizona)'' (MM Docket No. 99–351; RM–9785) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9953. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Mojave, California)'' (MM Docket No. 99–353; RM–9787) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9954. A communication from the Associate Managing Director-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2000, Report and Order'' (MD Docket No. 00–58. FCC 00–240) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9955. A communication from the Assistant Bureau Chief of Management, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Report and Order In the Matter of Redesignation of 17.7–19.7 GHz Frequency Band, Blanket Licensing of Satellite Earth Stations in 17.7–20.2 GHz and 27.5–30.0 GHz Frequency Bands, and Allocation of Additional Spectrum in 17.3–17.8 GHz and 24.75–25 .25 GHz Frequency Bands for Broadcast Satellite-Service Use'' (RIN IB Docket No. 98–172, FCC 00–212) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9956. A communication from the Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extending Wireless Telecommunications Services to Tribal Lands'' (Wt Docket No. 99–266, FCC 00–209) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9957. A communication from the Associate Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, Narrowband PCS, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making.'' (GEN Doc. 90–314, ET Doc. 92–100, PP Doc. 93–253, FCC 00–159) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9958. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report regarding the incidental capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shipping Operations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9959. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification relative to the termination of danger pay for Eritrea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9960. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of six rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama-Approval of Revisions to the Alabama State Implementation Plan: Transportation Conformity Interagency Memorandum of Agreement; Correction'' [FRL #6735–6], ''Azoxystrobin or Methyl(E)–2–3–; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions'' [FRL #6594–1], ''Butyl Acrylate-Vinyl Acetate-Acrylic Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption'' [FRL #6593–9], ''Humic Acid, Sodium Salt, Exemption Tolerance'' [FRL #6595–9], ''Pendimethalin; Re-establishment of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions'' [FRL #6596–5], ''Tebuconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions'' [FRL #6596–7] received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9961. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of five rules entitled ''Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) or Superfund, Section 311(b)(9)(A), CERCLA Section 311(b)(3) ''Announcement of Competition for EPA's Brownfields Job Training and Development Demonstration Pilots''' (FRL 6837–1), ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program'' (FRL 6838–5), ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revised 15% Plan for the Metropolitan Washington, DC Ozone Nonattainment Area'' (FRL 6735–4), ''Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL 6594–6), ''Vincloolin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL 65948) received on July 13, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9962. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Kern County Air Pollution Control District'' received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9963. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas Permitting of New and Modified Sources in Nonattainment Areas,'' (FRL 6735–3) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9964. A communication from the General Counsel of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of the Inspector General, Department of Defense Inspector General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9965. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9966. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 13–379 entitled ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 236, S.O. 00–49, Act of 2000''

adopted by the Council on July 11, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9967. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the copies of D.C. Act 13–378 entitled ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 288, S.O. 98–163, Act of 2000'' adopted by the Council on July 11, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9968. A communication from the Director of the Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Progress Payments for Foreign Military Sales Contracts'' (DFARS Case 2000–D009) received on July 12, 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–9969. A communication from the Chief of Programs and Legislation Division, Office of the Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, a notice relative to a cost comparison to reduce the cost of the Supply and Transportation function over a sixty month period at Anderson Air Force Base, Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–9970. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, a notification relative to functions performed by military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–9971. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Tropical Botanical Garden Annual Audit Report for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–9972. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Program: Procedures for the Conduct of Referendum'' (Docket Number: LS–99–14) received on July 14, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–9973. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Research and Promotion Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order'' (FV–99–701–FR) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–9974. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revenue Ruling 2000–33 Automatic Enrollment in Section 457(b) plans'' (Rev. Rul. 2000–33) received on July 17, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

f

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MACK, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2101: A bill to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries (Rept. No. 106–354).

By Mr. GRAMM, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2266: A bill to provide for the minting of commemorative coins to support the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and the programs of the United States Olympic Committee (Rept. No. 106–355).

By Mr. GRAMM, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2453: A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–356).

S. 2459: A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation (Rept. No. 106–357).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1474: A bill providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas (Rept. No. 106–358).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 2425: A bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the planning, design, and construction of the Bend Feed Canal Pipeline Project, Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–359).

f

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2908. A bill to authorize funding for successful reentry of criminal offenders into local communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 2909. A bill to permit landowners to assert otherwise-available state law defenses against property claims by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

f

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Res. 341. A resolution authorizing the printing of certain materials in honor of Paul Coverdell.

f

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2908. A bill to authorize funding for successful reentry of criminal offenders into local communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ACT OF 2000

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Offender Reentry and Community Safety Act of 2000. I am introducing this legislation because all too often we have short-term solutions for long-term problems. All too often we think about today, but not tomorrow. It's time that we start looking forward. It's time that we face the dire situation of prisoners re-entering our communities with insufficient monitoring, little or no job skills, inadequate drug treatment, insufficient housing and deficient basic life skills.

According to the Department of Justice, 1.25 million offenders are now living in prisons and another 600,000 offenders are incarcerated in local jails. A record number of those inmates—approximately 585,400 will return to communities this year. Historically, two-thirds of returning prisoners have been rearrested for new crimes within three years.

The safety threat posed by this volume of prisoner returns has been exacerbated by the fact that states and communities can't possibly properly supervise all their returning offenders, parole systems have been abolished in thirteen states and policy shifts toward more determinate sentencing have reduced the courts' authority to impose supervisory conditions on offenders returning to their communities.

State systems have also reduced the numbers of transitional support programs aimed at facilitating the return to productive community life styles. Recent studies indicate that many returning prisoners receive no help in finding employment upon release and most offenders have low literacy and other basic educational skills that can impede successful reentry.

At least 55 percent of offenders are fathers of minor children, and therefore face a number of issues related to child support and other family responsibilities during incarceration and after release. Substance abuse and mental health problems also add to concerns over community safety. Approximately 70 percent of state prisoners and 57 percent of federal prisoners have a history of drug use or abuse. Research by Justice indicates that between 60 and 75 percent of inmates with heroin or cocaine problems return to drugs within three months when untreated. An estimated 187,000 state and federal prison inmates have self-reported mental health problems. Mentally ill inmates are more likely than other offenders to have committed a violent offense and be violent recidivists. Few states connect mental health treatment in prisons with treatment in the return community. Finally, offenders with contagious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis are released with no viable plan to continue their medical treatment so they present a significant danger to public health. And while the federal prison population and reentry system differs from the state prison population and reentry systems, there are nonetheless significant reentry challenges at the federal level.

We need to start thinking about what to do with these people. We need to start thinking in terms of helping these people make a transition to the community so that they don't go back to a life of crime and can be productive members of our society. We need to start thinking about the long-term impact of what we do after we send people to jail

My legislation creates demonstration reentry programs for federal, state and local prisoners. The programs are designed to assist high-risk, high-need offenders who have served their prison

sentences, but who pose the greatest risk of reoffending upon release because they lack the education, job skills, stable family or living arrangements, and the substance abuse treatment and other mental and medical health services they need to successfully reintegrate into society.

Innovative strategies and emerging technologies present new opportunities to improve reentry systems. This legislation creates federal and state demonstration projects that utilize these strategies and technologies. The projects share many core components, including a more seamless reentry system, reentry officials who are more directly involved with the offender and who can swiftly impose intermediate sanctions if the offender does not follow the designated reentry plan, and the combination of enhanced service delivery and enhanced monitoring. The different projects are targeted at different prisoner populations and each has some unique features. The promise of the legislation is to establish the demonstration projects and then to rigorously evaluate them to determine which measures and strategies most successfully reintegrate prisoners into the community as well as which measures and strategies can be promoted nationally to address the growing national problem of released prisoners.

There are currently 17 unfunded state pilot projects, including one in Delaware, which are being supported with technical assistance by the Department of Justice. My legislation will fund these pilot projects and will encourage states, territories, and Indian tribes to partner with units of local government and other non-profit organizations to establish adult offender reentry demonstration projects. The grants may be expended for implementing graduated sanctions and incentives, monitoring released prisoners, and providing, as appropriate, drug and alcohol abuse testing and treatment, mental and medical health services, victim impact educational classes, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, and other social services. My legislation also encourages state agencies, municipalities, public agencies, nonprofit organizations and tribes to make agreements with courts to establish ''reentry courts'' to monitor returning offenders, establish graduated sanctions and incentives, test and treat returning offenders for drug and alcohol abuse, and provide reentering offenders with mental and medical health services, victim impact educational classes, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, and other social services.

This legislation also re-authorizes the drug court program created by Congress in the 1994 Crime Law as a cost-effective, innovative way to deal with non-violent offenders in need of drug treatment. This is the same language as the Drug Court Reauthorization and Improvement Act that I introduced with Senator SPECTER last year.

Rather than just churning people through the revolving door of the criminal justice system, drug courts help these folks to get their acts together so they won't be back. When they graduate from drug court programs they are clean and sober and more prepared to participate in society. In order to graduate, they are required to finish high school or obtain a GED, hold down a job, and keep up with financial obligations including drug court fees and child support payments. They are also required to have a sponsor who will keep them on track.

This program works. And that is not just my opinion. Columbia University's National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) found that these courts are effective at taking offenders with little previous treatment history and keeping them in treatment; that they provide closer supervision than other community programs to which the offenders could be assigned; that they reduce crime; and that they are cost-effective.

According to the Department of Justice, drug courts save at least $5,000 per offender each year in prison costs alone. That says nothing of the cost savings associated with future crime prevention. Just as important, scarce prison beds are freed up for violent criminals.

I have saved what may be the most important statistic for last. Two-thirds of drug court participants are parents of young children. After getting sober through the coerced treatment mandated by the court, many of these individuals are able to be real parents again. More than 500 drug-free babies have been born to female drug court participants, a sizable victory for society and the budget alike.

This bill reauthorizes programs to provide for drug treatment in state and federal prisons. According to CASA, 80 percent of the men and women behind bars in the United States today are there because of alcohol or drugs. They were either drunk or high when they committed their crime, broke an alcohol or drug law, stole to support their habit, or have a history of drug or alcohol abuse. The need for drug and alcohol treatment in our nations prisons and jails is clear.

Providing treatment to criminal offenders is not ''soft.'' It is a smart crime prevention policy. If we do not treat addicted offenders before they are released, they will be turned back onto our streets with the same addiction problem that got them in trouble in the first place and they will reoffend. Inmates who are addicted to drugs and alcohol are more likely to be incarcerated repeatedly than those without a substance abuse problem. This is not my opinion, it is fact. According to CASA, 81 percent of inmates with five or more prior convictions have been habitual drug users compared to 41 percent of first-time offenders. Reauthorizing prison-based treatment programs is a good investment and is an important crime prevention initiative.

This legislation is a first step. Someday, we will look back and wonder why we didn't think of this sooner. For now, we need to implement these pilot projects, help people make it in their communities and make our streets safer. I am certain that we will revel in the results.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Offender Reentry and Community Safety Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There are now nearly 1,900,000 individuals in our country's prisons and jails, including over 140,000 individuals under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

(2) Enforcement of offender violations of conditions of releases has sharply increased the number of offenders who return to prison—while revocations comprised 17 percent of State prison admissions in 1980, they rose to 36 percent in 1998.

(3) Although prisoners generally are serving longer sentences than they did a decade ago, most eventually reenter communities; for example, in 1999, approximately 538,000 State prisoners and over 50,000 Federal prisoners a record number were returned to American communities. Approximately 100,000 State offenders return to communities and received no supervision whatsoever.

(4) Historically, two-thirds of returning State prisoners have been rearrested for new crimes within three years, so these individuals pose a significant public safety risk and a continuing financial burden to society.

(5) A key element to effective post-incarceration supervision is an immediate, predetermined, and appropriate response to violations of the conditions of supervision.

(6) An estimated 187,000 State and Federal prison inmates have been diagnosed with mental health problems; about 70 percent of State prisoners and 57 percent of Federal prisoners have a history of drug use or abuse; and nearly 75 percent of released offenders with heroin or cocaine problems return to using drugs within three months if untreated; however, few States link prison mental health treatment programs with those in the return community.

(7) Between 1987 and 1997, the volume of juvenile adjudicated cases resulting in court-ordered residential placements rose 56 percent. In 1997 alone, there were a total of 163,200 juvenile court-ordered residential placements. The steady increase of youth exiting residential placement has strained the juvenile justice aftercare system, however, without adequate supervision and services, youth are likely to relapse, recidivate, and return to confinement at the public's expense.

(8) Emerging technologies and multidisciplinary community-based strategies present new opportunities to alleviate the public safety risk posed by released prisoners while helping offenders to reenter their communities successfully.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) establish demonstration projects in several Federal judicial districts, the District of

Columbia, and in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, using new strategies and emerging technologies that alleviate the public safety risk posed by released prisoners by promoting their successful reintegration into the community;

(2) establish court-based programs to monitor the return of offenders into communities, using court sanctions to promote positive behavior;

(3) establish offender reentry demonstration projects in the states using government and community partnerships to coordinate cost efficient strategies that ensure public safety and enhance the successful reentry into communities of offenders who have completed their prison sentences;

(4) establish intensive aftercare demonstration projects that address public safety and ensure the special reentry needs of juvenile offenders by coordinating the resources of juvenile correctional agencies, juvenile courts, juvenile parole agencies, law enforcement agencies, social service providers, and local Workforce Investment Boards; and

(5) rigorously evaluate these reentry programs to determine their effectiveness in reducing recidivism and promoting successful offender reintegration.

TITLE I—FEDERAL REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 101. FEDERAL REENTRY CENTER DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall establish the Federal Reentry Center Demonstration project. The project shall involve appropriate prisoners from the Federal prison population and shall utilize community corrections facilities, home confinement, and a coordinated response by Federal agencies to assist participating prisoners, under close monitoring and more seamless supervision, in preparing for and adjusting to reentry into the community.

(b) PROJECT ELEMENTS.—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a Reentry Review Team for each prisoner, consisting of representatives from the Bureau of Prisons, the United States Probation System, and the relevant community corrections facility, who shall initially meet with the prisoner to develop a reentry plan tailored to the needs of the prisoner and incorporating victim impact information, and will thereafter meet regularly to monitor the prisoner's progress toward reentry and coordinate access to appropriate reentry measures and resources;

(2) regular drug testing, as appropriate;

(3) a system of graduated levels of supervision within the community corrections facility to promote community safety, provide incentives for prisoners to complete the reentry plan, including victim restitution, and provide a reasonable method for imposing immediate sanctions for a prisoner's minor or technical violation of the conditions of participation in the project;

(4) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed;

(5) to the extent practicable, the recruitment and utilization of local citizen volunteers, including volunteers from the faith-based and business communities, to serve as advisers and mentors to prisoners being released into the community;

(6) a description of the methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program; and

(7) notification to victims on the status and nature of offenders' reentry plan.

(c) PROBATION OFFICERS.—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall assign one or more probation officers from each participating judicial district to the Reentry Demonstration project. Such officers shall be assigned to and stationed at the community corrections facility and shall serve on the Reentry Review Teams.

(d) PROJECT DURATION.—The Reentry Center Demonstration project shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Attorney General may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participant prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(e) SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Reentry Center Demonstration project.

(f) COORDINATION OF PROJECTS.—The Attorney General, may, if appropriate, include in the Reentry Center Demonstration project offenders who participated in the Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration project established by section 105 of this Act.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL HIGH-RISK OFFENDER REENTRY DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall establish the Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration project. The project shall involve Federal offenders under supervised release who have previously violated the terms of their release following a term of imprisonment and shall utilize, as appropriate and indicated, community corrections facilities, home confinement, appropriate monitoring technologies, and treatment and programming to promote more effective reentry into the community.

(b) PROJECT ELEMENTS.—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by Federal prisoners who have previously violated the terms of their release following a term of imprisonment;

(2) use of community corrections facilities and home confinement that, together with the technology referenced in paragraph (5), will be part of a system of graduated levels of supervision;

(3) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as appropriate;

(4) involvement of a victim advocate and the family of the prisoner, if it is safe for the victim(s), especially in domestic violence cases, to be involved;

(5) the use of monitoring technologies, as appropriate and indicated, to monitor and supervise participating offenders in the community;

(6) a description of the methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program; and

(7) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) MANDATORY CONDITION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE.—In each of the judicial districts in which the demonstration project is in effect, appropriate offenders who are found to have violated a previously imposed term of supervised release and who will be subject to some additional term of supervised release, shall be designated to participate in the demonstration project. With respect to these offenders, the court shall impose additional mandatory conditions of supervised release that each offender shall, as directed by the probation officer, reside at a community corrections facility or participate in a program of home confinement, or both, and submit to appropriate monitoring, and otherwise participate in the project.

(d) PROJECT DURATION.—The Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration shall begin not later than six months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may extend the project for a period of up to six months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(e) SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.—The Judicial Conference of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Federal High-Risk Offender Reentry Demonstration project.

SEC. 103. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTENSIVE SUPERVISION, TRACKING, AND REENTRY TRAINING (DC ISTART) DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—From funds made available to carry out this Act, the Trustee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712) shall establish the District of Columbia Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration (DC iSTART) project. The project shall involve high risk District of Columbia parolees who would otherwise be released into the community without a period of confinement in a community corrections facility and shall utilize intensive supervision, monitoring, and programming to promote such parolees' successful reentry into the community.

(b) PROJECT ELEMENTS.—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by appropriate high risk parolees;

(2) use of community corrections facilities and home confinement;

(3) a Reentry Review Team that includes a victim witness professional for each parolee which shall meet with the parolee—by video conference or other means as appropriate—before the parolee's release from the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to develop a reentry plan that incorporates victim impact information and is tailored to the needs of the parolee and which will thereafter meet regularly to monitor the parolee's progress toward reentry and coordinate access to appropriate reentry measures and resources;

(4) regular drug testing, as appropriate;

(5) a system of graduated levels of supervision within the community corrections facility to promote community safety, encourage victim restitution, provide incentives for prisoners to complete the reentry plan, and provide a reasonable method for immediately sanctioning a prisoner's minor or technical violation of the conditions of participation in the project;

(6) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer

intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed and indicated;

(7) the use of monitoring technologies, as appropriate;

(8) to the extent practicable, the recruitment and utilization of local citizen volunteers, including volunteers from the faith-based communities, to serve as advisers and mentors to prisoners being released into the community; and

(9) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) MANDATORY CONDITION OF PAROLE.—For those offenders eligible to participate in the demonstration project, the United States Parole Commission shall impose additional mandatory conditions of parole such that the offender when on parole shall, as directed by the community supervision officer, reside at a community corrections facility or participate in a program of home confinement, or both, submit to electronic and other remote monitoring, and otherwise participate in the project.

(d) PROGRAM DURATION.—The District of Columbia Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Trustee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL INTENSIVE SUPERVISION, TRACKING, AND REENTRY TRAINING (FED iSTART) DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—From funds made available to carry out this section, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish the Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration (FED iSTART) project. The project shall involve appropriate high risk Federal offenders who are being released into the community without a period of confinement in a community corrections facility.

(b) PROJECT ELEMENTS.—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) participation by appropriate high risk Federal offenders;

(2) significantly smaller caseloads for probation officers participating in the demonstration project;

(3) substance abuse treatment and aftercare, mental and medical health treatment and aftercare, vocational and educational training, life skills instruction, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, assistance obtaining suitable affordable housing, and other programming to promote effective reintegration into the community as needed; and

(4) notification to victims on the status and nature of a prisoner's reentry plan.

(c) PROGRAM DURATION.—The Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration shall begin not later than 6 months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may extend the project for a period of up to six months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

(d) SELECTION OF DISTRICTS.—The Judicial Conference of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall select an appropriate number of Federal judicial districts in which to carry out the Federal Intensive Supervision, Tracking and Reentry Training Demonstration project.

SEC. 105. FEDERAL ENHANCED IN-PRISON VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—From funds made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall establish the Federal Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration project in selected institutions. The project shall provide in-prison assessments of prisoners' vocational needs and aptitudes, enhanced work skills development, enhanced release readiness programming, and other components as appropriate to prepare Federal prisoners for release and reentry into the community.

(b) PROGRAM DURATION.—The Enhanced In-Prison Vocational Assessment and Training Demonstration shall begin not later than six months following the availability of funds to carry out this section, and shall last 3 years. The Attorney General may extend the project for a period of up to 6 months to enable participating prisoners to complete their involvement in the project.

SEC. 106. RESEARCH AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act. Not later than 1 year after the end of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry projects authorized by sections 101 and 105 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report shall address post-release outcomes and recidivism for a period of 3 years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act. Not later than 180 days after the end of the demonstration projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry projects authorized by sections 102 and 104 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report should address post-release outcomes and recidivism for a period of 3 years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(c) DC ISTART.—Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712) shall report to Congress on the progress of the demonstration project authorized by section 6 of this Act. Not later than 1 year after the end of the demonstration project authorized by section 103 of this Act, the Executive Director of the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712) shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the reentry project authorized by section 103 of this Act on post-release outcomes and recidivism. The report shall address post-release outcomes and recidivism for a period of three years following release from custody. The reports submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In the event that the corporation or institute authorized by section 11281(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712) is not in operation 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Institute of Justice shall prepare and submit the reports required by this section and may do so from funds made available to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712) to carry out this Act.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) the term ''appropriate prisoner'' means a person who is considered by prison authorities—

(A) to pose a medium to high risk of committing a criminal act upon reentering the community, and

(B) to lack the skills and family support network that facilitate successful reintegration into the community; and

(2) the term ''appropriate high risk parolees'' means parolees considered by prison authorities—

(A) to pose a medium to high risk of committing a criminal act upon reentering the community; and

(B) to lack the skills and family support network that facilitate successful reintegration into the community.

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

To carry out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, the following amounts:

(1) To the Federal Bureau of Prisons—

(A) $1,375,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(B) $1,110,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(C) $1,130,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(D) $1,155,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(E) $1,230,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(2) To the Federal Judiciary—

(A) $3,380,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(B) $3,540,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(C) $3,720,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(D) $3,910,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(E) $4,100,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(3) To the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Pub. Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712)—

(A) $4,860,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(B) $4,510,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(C) $4,620,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(D) $4,740,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(E) $4,860,000 for fiscal year 2005.

TITLE II—STATE REENTRY GRANT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) as amended, is amended—

(1) by redesignating part Z as part AA;

(2) by redesignating section 2601 as section 2701; and

(3) by inserting after part Y the following new part:

''PART Z OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

"SEC. 2601. ADULT OFFENDER STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY PARTNERSHIPS.

''(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to $1,000,000

to States, Territories, and Indian tribes, in partnership with units of local government and nonprofit organizations, for the purpose of establishing adult offender reentry demonstration projects. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

''(1) oversight/monitoring of released offenders;

''(2) providing returning offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental health assessment and services;

''(3) convening community impact panels, victim impact panels or victim impact educational classes;

''(4) providing and coordinating the delivery of other community services to offenders such as housing assistance, education, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other social services as appropriate; and

''(5) establishing and implementing graduated sanctions and incentives.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

''(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

''(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

''(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program, including existing community corrections and parole; and

''(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluating the program.

''(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2601(a)—

''(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2601(b); and

''(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

''(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

''(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

''(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

''(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002; and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

''(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

''(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

''SEC. 2602. STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY COURTS.

''(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to $500,000 to State and local courts or state agencies, municipalities, public agencies, nonprofit organizations, and tribes that have agreements with courts to take the lead in establishing a reentry court. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

''(1) monitoring offenders returning to the community;

''(2) providing returning offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental and medical health assessment and services;

''(3) convening community impact panels, victim impact panels, or victim impact educational classes;

''(4) providing and coordinating the delivery of other community services to offenders, such as housing assistance, education, employment training, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, and other social services as appropriate; and

''(5) establishing and implementing graduated sanctions and incentives.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

''(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

''(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

''(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies, including existing community corrections and parole, and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program;

''(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluation the program.

''(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2602(a)—

''(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2602(b); and

''(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

''(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

''(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

''(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

''(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

''(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

''(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

''SEC. 2603. JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY PROGRAMS.

''(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants of up to $250,000 to States, in partnership with local units of governments or nonprofit organizations, for the purpose of establishing juvenile offender reentry programs. Funds may be expended by the projects for the following purposes:

''(1) providing returning juvenile offenders with drug and alcohol testing and treatment and mental and medical health assessment and services;

''(2) convening victim impact panels, restorative justice panels, or victim impact educational classes for juvenile offenders;

''(3) oversight/monitoring of released juvenile offenders; and

''(4) providing for the planning of reentry services when the youth is initially incarcerated and coordinating the delivery of community-based services, such as education, conflict resolution skills training, batterer intervention programs, employment training and placement, efforts to identify suitable living arrangements, family involvement and support, and other services.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—In addition to any other requirements that may be specified by the Attorney General, an application for a grant under this subpart shall—

''(1) describe a long-term strategy and detailed implementation plan, including how the jurisdiction plans to pay for the program after the Federal funding ends;

''(2) identify the governmental and community agencies that will be coordinated by this project;

''(3) certify that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies, including existing community corrections and parole, in the implementation of the program;

''(4) describe the methodology and outcome measures that will be used in evaluating the program.

''(c) APPLICANTS.—The applicants as designated under 2603(a)—

''(1) shall prepare the application as required under subsection 2603(b); and

''(2) shall administer grant funds in accordance with the guidelines, regulations, and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General, as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

''(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Federal share of a grant received under this title may not exceed 25 percent of the costs of the project funded under this title unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the requirements of this section.

''(e) REPORTS.—Each entity that receives a grant under this part shall submit to the Attorney General, for each year in which funds from a grant received under this part is expended, a report at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require that contains:

''(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant and an assessment of whether such activities are meeting the needs identified in the application funded under this part; and

''(2) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as are necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year—

''(A) not more than 2 percent or less than 1 percent may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses; and

''(B) not more than 3 percent or less than 2 percent may be used for technical assistance and training.

''SEC. 2604. STATE REENTRY PROGRAM RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EVALUATION.

''(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants to conduct research on a range of issues pertinent to reentry programs, the development and testing of new reentry components and approaches, selected evaluation of projects authorized in the preceding sections, and dissemination of information to the field.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and such sums as are necessary to carry out this section in fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.), as amended, is amended by striking the matter relating to part Z and inserting the following:

''PART Z OFFENDER REENTRY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ACT

''Sec. 2601. Adult Offender State and Local Reentry Partnerships.

''Sec. 2602. State and Local Reentry Courts.

''Sec. 2603. Juvenile Offender State and Local Reentry Programs.

''Sec. 2604. State Reentry Program Research and Evaluation.

''PART AA—TRANSITION—EFFECTIVE DATE—REPEALER

''Sec. 2701. Continuation of rules, authorities, and proceedings.''.

TITLE III—SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN FEDERAL PRISONS REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT IN FEDERAL PRISONS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 3621(e)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

''(E) $31,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

''(F) $38,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.''.

TITLE IV—RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT FOR STATE PRISONERS REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZATION.

Paragraph (17) of section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(17)) is amended to read as follows:

''(17) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part S $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2002 through 2006.''.

SEC. 402. USE OF RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT GRANTS TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES DURING AND AFTER INCARCERATION.

Section 1901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ADDITIONAL USE OF FUNDS.—States that demonstrate that they have existing in-prison drug treatment programs that are in compliance with Federal requirements may use funds awarded under this part for treatment and sanctions both during incarceration and after release.''.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 2909. A bill to permit landowners to assert otherwise-available state law defenses against property claims by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LANDOWNERS DEFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY CLAIMS BY INDIAN TRIBES LEGISLATION

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2909

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Subchapter 1 of Chapter 6 of Title 25 is amended by inserting as §210 the following:

SECTION 1. DEFENSES TO INDIAN CLAIMS.

Except as provided in Section 2, in any action, or claim by or on behalf of an Indian tribe to enforce a real-property right, or otherwise asserting a claim of Indian title or right, the defendant may assert any affirmative defense that would be available under state law to a defendant opposing an analogous action or claim that does not involve an Indian tribe.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FOR GOVERNMENTAL DEFENDANTS.

Section 1 shall not apply to any action or claim against a governmental entity with respect to land that is located within sovereign Indian country.

SEC. 3. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) Excepts as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall be construed and applied without regard to the interpretive judicial canon that remaining ambiguities should be resolved in favor of the Indians when standard tools of statutory construction leave no indication as to the meaning of an Indian treaty or statute.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to judicial interpretation of an Indian treaty with respect to a determination of whether land was reserved or set aside by the federal government for the use of an Indian tribe as Indian land.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

(1) The term ''Indian tribe,'' as used in this Act, means any tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that is recognized by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. §479a).

(2) The term ''sovereign Indian country'' means land—

(A) that is rightfully owned by, or is held in trust by the federal government for, an Indian tribe;

(B) that was reserved or set aside for the use of the Indian tribe as Indian land by the federal government, and is either—

(i) outside the exterior geographical limits of any State; or

(ii) within the exterior geographical limits of a State that subsequently either—

(A) acknowledged Indian title to the land involved when the land was made a part of the State, if that State be one of the original 13 States to form the United States; or

(B) provided, either in the Act providing for the State's admission to the United States or in the State's first constitution, that all lands held by Indians within the State shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the United States, in accordance with Article I, Section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States, if that State were admitted to the United States after 1790; and

(C) for which the Indian title has not been extinguished or the jurisdiction reservation revoked.

SEC. 5. ATTORNEYS FEES.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), in any action or proceeding that is subject to this Act, the court shall allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee with respect to a claim presented by the opposing party that was frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation, or that the opposing party continued to litigate after it clearly became so.

(1) A claim shall be deemed legally frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation only if it rests upon a legal theory that was clearly unavailable under existing case law.

(2) A claim shall be deemed factually frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation only if its proponent knew or should have know of those facts that would require judgment for the opposing party as a matter of law.

(b) EXCEPTION.—No attorney's fee shall be assessed under subsection (a) against an Indian tribe seeking to enforce a right to an interest in land if the court determines that the land involved is located within sovereign Indian country.

SEC. 6. TIMING OF APPLICATION.

This Act shall apply to any action, claim, or right described in Section 1 that is pending, filed, or continuing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, other than a final money-damages judgment to which no one has a right to raise a challenge by any available procedure.

f

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to change the determination of the 50,000-barrel refinery limitation on oil depletion deduction from a daily basis to an annual average daily basis.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the tax on the social security benefits.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the

Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation water, and for other purposes.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of printed wiring board and printed wiring assembly equipment.

S. 1086

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account to the extent that the distribution is contributed for charitable purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide States with the option to allow legal immigrant pregnant women and children to be eligible for medical assistance under the medical program, and for other purposes.

S. 2078

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his outstanding athletic accomplishments and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2217, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2434

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2434, a bill to provide that amounts allotted to a State under section 2401 of the Social Security Act for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999 shall remain available through fiscal year 2002.

S. 2586

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2586, a bill to reduce the backlog in the processing of immigration benefit applications and to make improvements to infrastructure necessary for the effective provision of immigration services, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects, and to increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating chances for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and implementation of those Acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2686

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2686, a bill to amend chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, to modify rates relating to reduced rate mail matter, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to provide for the preservation of assisted housing for low income elderly persons, disabled persons, and other families.

S. 2739

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2739, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of a semipostal stamp in order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for the establishment of the World War II Memorial.

S. 2764

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, a bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for the programs carried out under such Acts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, supra.

S. 2787

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2787, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2806

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2806, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to terminate mortgagee origination approval for poorly performing mortgagees.

S. 2828

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that the Secretary of Health and Human Services wage adjust the actual, rather than the estimated, proportion of a hospital's costs that are attributable to wages and wage-related costs.

S. 2841

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2841, a bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides

for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2843, a bill for the relief of Antonio Costa.

S. 2894

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2894, a bill to provide tax and regulatory relief for farmers and to improve the competitiveness of American agricultural commodities and products in global markets.

S. 2903

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the child tax credit.

S. CON. RES. 130

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 130, concurrent resolution establishing a special task force to recommend an appropriate recognition for the slave laborers who worked on the construction of the United States Capitol.

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 130, supra.

S.J. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 48, a joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

S.J. RES. 50

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 50, a joint resolution to disapprove a final rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency concerning water pollution.

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 294, a resolution designating the month of October 2000 as ''Children's Internet Safety Month.''

S. RES. 301

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 301, a resolution designating August 16, 2000, as ''National Airborne Day.''

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' for the presentation of such educational programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3987

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3987 proposed to H.R. 4461, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

f

SENATE RESOLUTION 341—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN HONOR OF PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. LOTT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 341

Resolved, That the eulogies and other related materials concerning the Honorable Paul Coverdell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, be printed as a Senate Document.

f

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 26, 2000, in SH–216 at 8:30 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review the Federal sugar program.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 27, 2000, in SH–216 at 9 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review proposals to establish an international school lunch program.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, August 10, 2000, at 10:30 a.m. in the Alaska Native Brotherhood Hall; 320 Willoughby Ave, Juneau, Alaska 99801.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony to assist in establishing the value of the Brady Glacier mineral deposit within Glacier Bay National Park; and to examine implications of National Park Service restrictions on commercial fishing in Glacier Bay.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mike Menge (202) 224–6170

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the hearing to conduct oversight on the status of the Biological Opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the operations of the Federal hydropower system of the Columbia River regarding the National Marine Fisheries Service's draft Biological Opinion and its potential impact on the Columbia River operations, which had been previously scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC has been indefinitely postponed.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, staff assistant, or Colleen Deegan, counsel, at (202) 224–8115.

f

THE TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I came to the floor to tell my colleagues my disappointment that we are not able to move forward with the Treasury and general government bill. It is certainly not a perfect bill, but it is a darn good bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I can say that we worked very hard on that. I remind my friends that we only have about 28 working days left—not much to complete the whole appropriations process, which we are required to do by law. That gets us in trouble.

Two years ago, we didn't have the opportunity to complete the Treasury bill, and it ended up in what is commonly referred to as the omnibus bill. People in the Senate understand what

that is, but to the millions of Americans who watch these proceedings, the omnibus bill is, in one word, a mess. It is that bill where we stick everything in at the end that we didn't have time to finish. We end up with a bill a foot thick and weighs 30 pounds, with 3,000 to 5,000 pages. Nobody in this body can read it all because we don't have the time before we have to vote on it. That is how we get in trouble. We vote to pass it through as a last-minute emergency. When we go home, people say: Why did you vote to give money to that frivolous thing on page 2,403? And we don't even know why we voted for it, which is why it is so important to get the bills through one by one.

Let me mention a little bit about the Treasury and general government bill as it is going to come to the floor, if we can get an agreement. I don't think there is anybody in this body who doesn't know that we have a sieve, not a border, between the U.S. and Canada and the U.S. and Mexico. Our customs people are severely understaffed and underfunded. If you want to stop drugs at the border, the money to do that is in this bill. We need to do that. The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas we started about 8 years ago expanded to about 44 States and many cities. That is the agency that coordinates reduction of drug use and trafficking among our local law enforcement, State law enforcement, and Federal law enforcement.

If you want to reduce drug trafficking, the money is in this bill. We also have upkeep and maintenance for Federal buildings. A number of them nationwide are in disrepair, as everybody knows. We have to put money into making sure the buildings are sound, safe, and fireproof. We are not doing that very well. The money to do that is in this bill, too. If you want to reduce drug violence, the money to do that is in this bill. We know this is a very important year for the Secret Service. They are being asked to do more in an election year, with limited resources. The money to do that is also in this bill.

In fact, as all of us know, there are many, many requests by individual Senators in all of these bills. I was going through the list on our bill. We have 13 pages of requests by individual Senators for money in this bill. It is rather surprising to me that some of the Senators who are opposing bringing this bill to the floor are the ones who asked for money to be put in the bill in the first place. It is similar to when we consider the so-called pay raise and people demagog it, the thing passes, and they quietly pocket the money and leave. We have the same situation with this bill. A lot of people have very important programs in this bill. Again, there are 13 pages of things Senators want in this bill.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a program which I believe deserves the support of the Senate—the Gang Resistance Education and Training or GREAT Program. GREAT is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in partnership with State and local law enforcement.

Unfortunately, gang activity has increased in our country in recent years. ATF has developed a program to give our children the tools they need to be able to resist the temptation to belong to a gang.

The GREAT program is eight years old, and has grown from a pilot program in Arizona to classrooms all over the United States—and in Puerto Rico, Canada, and overseas military bases. ATF estimates that about 2 million students have received GREAT training.

GREAT was designed to provide gang prevention and antiviolence instruction to children in a classroom setting. ATF trains local law enforcement officers to teach these classes, and provides grants to their offices to help pay for their time.

This program is having a positive effect on student activities and behaviors, and is deterring them from involvement in gangs. A side benefit is that the graduates seem to be doing a better job of communicating with their parents and teachers, and getting better grades.

For the third year in a row, the Administration is requesting only 10 million dollars for grants for the GREAT program. For the last two years, Congress felt that wasn't enough to fund the many requests for help from State and local law enforcement and provided 13 million dollars for GREAT grants. 10 million dollars still isn't enough. I urge my colleagues to support the effort of the Committee to again provide 13 million dollars for grants to State and local law enforcement for this worthwhile and effective program.

I hope my colleagues will reach some consensus and allow us to move forward. It is an extremely important bill, and I certainly urge our leadership to try to get this to the floor.

With that, I yield the floor.

f

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SLAIN CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:40 having arrived, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in honor of Capitol Police Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were killed in the line of duty in the Capitol two years ago today.

[Moment of silence]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senate for honoring the two dedicated police officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I have one further comment. Both of these officers put their lives on the line, as all of our Capitol Police officers do and, indeed, officers in law enforcement across the country. J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson were personal friends to many of us. I used to be a policeman years ago, as some of my colleagues know. I collect shoulder patches, which are pretty easy to get. Most police organizations will send them to you if you like to collect them. John had a collection and we used to trade shoulder patches. If he had two of a patch I didn't have, or if I had two of one he didn't have, we would trade back and forth.

When you talk about the Capitol Police, they are not just uniforms; these are real people with real lives and real families.

Both of them left a wife and children, as the Presiding Officer knows. It has been 2 years, but they are still fresh in my mind—and that is a tragedy.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I understand we are in morning business; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there a limitation on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

f

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, we have recently witnessed another example of the indifference of Members of Congress to the needs of hard-working, low-wage American workers. While our minimum wage bill still languishes, Members of Congress are raising their own pay yet again. Congress has cut the taxes of the wealthiest Americans, but the Republican leadership still insists on doing nothing for those at the bottom of the economic ladder. It is an outrage that Congress would raise its own pay but not the minimum wage.

Over the past decade, in spite of the recent prosperity, the average inflation-adjusted income of the poorest fifth of Americans rose by only 1 percent, while the average inflation adjusted-income of the richest 5 percent rose by 27 percent.

The Republican Congress just passed an estate tax repeal that provides 100 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans and 91 percent

of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent. The Republican marriage tax penalty bill passed last week is also heavily tilted to benefit only the wealthy. Members of this Republican Congress are quick to find time to increase their own salaries and cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, but they cannot find the time to pass an increase in the minimum wage to benefit those hard-working, low-wage Americans.

These low-income working families deserve a raise. Their pay has been frozen for 3 years, and our Democratic proposal will increase the minimum wage by 50 cents this year and another 50 cents next year. The Republican leadership is doing all it can to prevent this fair increase, but this issue will not go away, and we will continue to offer our minimum wage amendment to bills on the floor again and again at every opportunity until we pass it and send it to the President for his signature.

In recent months, a bipartisan House voted by a solid majority to increase the minimum wage by $1 over 2 years, and many of our Senate colleagues have also supported an increase: 50 cents now and 50 cents a year from now.

The American people agree that the minimum wage should be increased. The time is now to give America's hard-working families the raise they so desperately need and deserve. It is unconscionable for the Republican leadership to vote themselves a pay raise yet again, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and then deny workers at the bottom of the economic ladder a fair pay increase. Our Democratic proposal offers workers the minimum wage raise they need and deserve: No tricks, no poison pills, no tax breaks for the wealthy, and we have bipartisan support for this increase.

The issue is a priority. The Senate should act on a fair minimum wage bill, and we should act as soon as possible. It is wrong for the Senate to continue to block this long overdue act of simple justice for working families.

This chart shows the real value of the minimum wage. It is from 1968 up to the year 2001. If we were to take the real value and use constant dollars, the minimum wage would be $7.66, if we were to have the same purchasing power as we had in 1968.

We have seen the minimum wage decline over these years, particularly in recent years. Without an increase, it will be valued at $4.90. If we were to have the increase of 50 cents and 50 cents, the purchasing power would only be $5.85, which is still below what it was for over 12 years. That is all we are asking: Let's bring it up by 50 cents this year and 50 cents next year. Even though that would be $6.15, it represents $5.85 of purchasing power in constant dollars.

What we are seeing is that it is almost $2 lower than what the minimum wage was in 1968. This is against the situation, if one looks over this particular chart, that working families are living in poverty. If one looks at what has happened, again in constant dollars, of where the minimum wage has been going in recent years in adjusted inflation dollars, then one sees where the poverty line has been going in recent years.

We are finding out now that since 1988, minimum wage workers are working, in many instances, longer, harder, more jobs, and are sinking deeper and deeper into poverty.

This is against the background of the last 10 days where we gave over $1.5 trillion—a huge amount in estate taxes, the majority of which goes to the highest income individuals, and $300 billion to the wealthiest individuals in marriage tax penalty relief. Then last week, the House of Representatives voted themselves a $3,800 pay increase. That represents what a minimum wage worker would make in 2 years. They voted themselves that in 1 year.

This is where we have seen America's poorest families are getting poorer. The bottom fifth of the families are right at the edge where they have been from 1979 to 1999, 20 years, working harder, working longer, and their benefit from the economic expansion is virtually nonexistent. The middle fifth has gone up 5 percent, and the top fifth of families has gone up 30 percent.

These are the men and women who are the backbone of the whole economic expansion. Yet they are the ones who are experiencing almost crumbs in advancing their quality of life and their lifestyle.

Last week, we saw all this happening in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives increased their pay by $3,800 a year. As I mentioned, if our minimum wage amendment is passed, it works out to be less than $2000.

Even if we give the increase in the minimum wage, minimum wage workers in 2 years will make half of what the pay increase will be for Members of Congress.

That is not bad enough, but Congressman DELAY was asked by a columnist, Mark Shields:

> Can you and Dick Armey and others who voted for that pay raise or cost-of-living increase defend voting against an increase in the minimum wage?

Mr. DELAY said:

> Well, Mark, we don't work for minimum wage. . . .

How dismissive can one be? Evidently, Members of Congress, their children, and their lives are more important than workers who are working hard as children's aides in the Head Start Program, or working in nursing homes taking care of seniors.

These are men and women who have a great sense of dignity and pride in their work, working, in many instances, two or three jobs.

Mr. DELAY says:

> [W]e don't work for minimum wage. Members of Congress represent 250 million people. . . .''

How dismissive: We are more important.

I defy that. These are men and women who are working, and working hard, and who have a sense of dignity and a sense of pride in the work they do. They are teachers' aides. They are children's aides, working in child care programs. They work in nursing homes. They work in the buildings across this country in order to make the buildings clean for American industry.

This is basically a women's issue because the great majority of minimum wage workers are women. It is a children's issue because millions of the women who are working at the minimum wage have children, and their lives are all being affected by this. It is a civil rights issue because great numbers of the minimum wage workers are men and women of color. And most profoundly, it is a fairness issue, where we hear so many speeches here in the Senate saying: We honor work. We want Americans who want to work.

Here are men and women, who are working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, trying to make ends meet, trying to bring up children, trying to pay for rent because they don't have the income in order to purchase a house, trying to put food on the table, and trying to spend some time with their families.

It is an interesting fact, American workers now spend 22 hours less per week with their children. Why? Because they have to work at more jobs, and to work longer at their jobs. So it is a family issue.

Of all the times we listen to statements about family values and fairness in our society, we are crying crocodile tears, evidently, because we heard last week that people who have estates over $100 million should not be taxed twice. Even if you scored $100 million, we are still going to provide more tax breaks. We refuse to even permit a vote on an increase in the minimum wage here in the Senate, while we are going out and increasing our own salary, and doing it in a contemptuous way to these men and women. Shame on this body.

We are going to bring this up. We have heard a lot about: This is not relevant. Is it going to be fair to bring this up? We are going to be told that we do not set the agenda in the Senate.

I can just tell you, there are men and women who have struggled, and struggled mightily, and are struggling today. They deserve the increase. These arguments about inflation are out the window. Every economic indicator has demonstrated that the last two increases have had no impact in any way in terms of inflation. The idea that we are going to have lost jobs is absolutely preposterous. Every economic study has indicated the same. We have responded to those arguments.

This is a fairness issue. It is a decency issue. It is about our fellow citizens. It is about work. It is about families. It is about children. It is about

women. It is about fairness in civil rights. We are going to continue to pursue this item. We are going to pursue it this week and the 4 weeks when we return in September. We are going to continue to pursue it until we have justice for these workers.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

f

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN OUR NATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, on several occasions I have risen before this body to address the crisis associated with energy in our Nation today. We have all experienced the high price of gasoline. We have seen a slight reduction of late, but I want to assure my colleagues that that situation is temporary, at best.

The rationale for that is understandable if one considers the fact that we are currently consuming just about an amount equal to the productive capacity of our industry to supply gasoline. There are many good reasons for this. One is that we haven't built a new refinery in this country for almost 10 years now. We have closed about 37 refineries in the United States in the last decade and, as a consequence of our increased dependence on imported oil, we have lost a good deal of our leverage because currently about 56 percent of the oil we consume in this country is imported. Most of that comes from the Mideast. As a consequence, we have become more dependent on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The fastest-growing supply of oil now coming into the United States is from Iraq. That is rather curious. A lot of people forget that in 1991 we fought a war over there. We lost 147 lives. We had nearly 427 wounded. We had a number taken prisoner. Yet Saddam Hussein is the one we are looking toward now.

I think the American public should be aware that it is pretty difficult to define just what the energy policy of the Clinton-Gore administration has been. We have seen their policy with regard to the nuclear industry, which provides about 20 percent of the power generated in this country, and they have said no to storing high-level nuclear waste. We are one vote short of a veto override on that matter. We have not been able to generate that last vote. So it is clear that the administration has said no to the nuclear industry, as far as expanding its contribution to energy in this country.

As we look to hydroelectric, we have seen a policy which suggests that perhaps some of the dams out West should be taken down, with no consideration for the realization that there is a tradeoff associated with that. If you take those dams down, you are taking the tonnage that is moved by barge and putting it on the highways. The implication of that is significant. It is estimated that as many as 700,000 trucks per year would have to go on the highways to replace the current cargo capacity of barges that would be lost.

If we take away nuclear and go to hydro, oil is certainly something we are looking toward other nations to provide, as opposed to developing the resources here in the continental United States, in the overthrust belt of Colorado, Wyoming, and other areas, and where there is oil in my State of Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, Texas, and other States. It is my understanding that the administration has withdrawn about 64 percent of the public land in the overthrust belt, which is in the Rocky Mountain areas, excluding them from the development of energy resources. The potential for coal, of course, is significant. There are no new coal plants being built in this country. The cost of permitting is such that we find they are uneconomical. The emphasis seems to be on natural gas. But if we look to the last 6 months, we have seen natural gas prices go from about $2.16 to over $4 for delivery later this winter.

The crisis associated with our energy policy, or lack of an energy policy, is real in every field of energy resources. Emphasis is placed by the administration to some extent on renewables. While we all support renewables, it is fair to say that renewables only constitute about 40 percent of our energy consumption, even though we have spent about $70 billion in subsidies in this area. While they have a potential, surely they are not at the forefront nor are they capable at this time of relieving our dependence on conventional energy sources.

As we look at our policies today, I think there is confusion in the minds of Americans as they reflect on the statements of their political leaders and the policies they pursue. It is very easy to be confused.

I would like to share some examples with my colleagues.

If we go back to our Vice President, AL GORE, in his book ''Earth in the Balance,'' AL GORE, the environmentalist, wrote that ''higher taxes on fossil fuel . . . is one of the logical first steps in changing our policies in a manner consistent with a more responsible approach to the environment.''

All of us are obviously concerned over the health of our environment. We want to have a responsible approach associated with the environment. Nevertheless, the idea that raising the price of gasoline is good for the American economy and good for the American people is pretty hard to sell to the American public at this time when gasoline prices, depending on where we are in the country, range anywhere from $1.75 to $1.95 or higher.

I think it is fair to say that perhaps the Vice President overlooks the reality that Americans live long distances from their jobs because they prefer to do so. We are a mobile society. As we are confronted with higher energy prices, obviously it not only affects our pocketbooks, but it affects inflation rates.

At about the same time that the Clinton/Gore administration was talking about conservation, the Vice President was casting a tie-breaking vote in the Senate to raise gasoline taxes—we all remember that—and the Environmental Protection Agency determined that more expensive ''reformulated gasoline'' needed to be sold in many areas of the country.

I am not arguing the merits of that—other than to report that before my committee on Energy and Natural Resources, one of the principals of the Environmental Protection Agency advised us that they are now required under the Clean Air Act to have nine different types of reformulated gasoline in this country.

That meant our refiners had to batch the gasoline additives, they had to transport it separately, they had to store it separately. Obviously, all of that has a significant cost for the taxpayer. According to a memorandum from the Department of Energy and the Congressional Research Service, EPA's gasoline requirements balkanized markets, strained supplies, and raised prices.

Since the policies of the administration were so effective in raising the prices, one might expect the Vice President to be pleased. But confronted with angry consumers on the campaign trail, the Vice President suggests that refiners and oil companies are to blame. A lot of finger-pointing is going on around here.

Let me refer to an article that appeared in the Washington Times of July 19. This is an editorial covering a memorandum that came from the Clinton Energy Department suggesting that the Department was indeed aware that the administration's own regulations pertaining to so-called ''reformulated'' gasoline, rather than the oil industry gouging, were primarily responsible for the increased price of motor fuels.

The reformulated gas—RFG—rule, which stipulated that refiners mix different types of gasoline for different localities, has made it impossible, or at least very difficult, to take advantage of the economies of scale in production and distribution that heretofore have helped keep U.S. energy prices stable and low.

Their memo, which was sent June 5—a full week before the administration began to blame the oil industry for raising fuel prices—states that the RFG reformulated gasoline rule was a major reason for the price spike, delaying claims made by the administration that they couldn't see any reason other than blind greed for the change in per-gallon gasoline prices.

I am not here to defend the industry, but I think it is fair to say that for the administration and the media to simply overlook what the cost of reformulated gasoline, applied regionally in this country with nine specific types of reformulated gasoline, has done to the price of gasoline speaks for itself.

It is kind of interesting. This article said something to the effect that the media and Dan Rather stated during the July 14 broadcast that, ''Republicans today sided with the oil companies against the Clinton/Gore administration on the question of who and what is to blame for higher gasoline prices.''

When you invoke this type of mandate on the first of June, you are certainly going to get a reaction from the American public when the price of reformulated gasoline goes up dramatically, particularly in the Midwest. That is what is known around here—and we are no strangers to it—as ''dancing the sidestep.''

Another example of the Clinton/Gore administration's attitude towards energy goes back a little further, when we needed Russia's support—or at least its acquiescence—in NATO's war in Kosovo. There is strong evidence that the administration sought to persuade OPEC to cut production and drive crude oil prices up some 18 months ago. It seems this was done to help Russia, an oil exporter generally badly in need of hard currency, in exchange for its acquiescence—which we got—in NATO's war in Kosovo.

Despite the fact that his own administration colluded with OPEC to manipulate prices, our Vice President has called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate oil companies and refiners—for colluding to manipulate prices. I don't know how long that is going to take, but I suspect it is going to take some time for that investigation to be completed. In any event, I find that highly ironic.

Here is another example.

We have all heard that our Vice President says he wants to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil in the volatile Middle East. But his stated policy is to curtail Federal oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf. We heard him make that statement in Louisiana, that, if elected, he would terminate leases and buy back others.

He would also defer any opening of public land in the Rocky Mountain Overthrust Belt in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. He also urged the President to veto a 1995 bill allowing a small sliver of the Alaska Coastal Plain to be opened for oil and gas exploration.

That area, I might add, in my State of Alaska, could have enough oil to replace imports of Saudi Arabian oil for the next 30 years. It is estimated the area might contain as much as 16 billion barrels. Of further note, the area known as ANWR has 19 million acres, most of which is already set aside in wilderness. The remaining acreage, 1.5 million acres, is left for Congress to make a determination on. The industry says that out of that 1.5 million acres, oil is in abundance. With the advancement of technology we have in building icy roads in the wilderness, the footprint will be less than 2,000 acres. Clearly, the Clinton-Gore administration will not give us an opportunity to make a determination whether domestically we can reduce our dependence on imported oil and develop this very important resource in my State of Alaska.

Over the past 8 years, domestic production in this country has plummeted 17 percent as demand for foreign oil has risen 14 percent. We now depend on foreign oil to supply 56 percent of our needs. The averages of the last few weeks are as much as 64 and 65 percent. However, during the disastrous 1973 Arab oil embargo, we were only 35-percent dependent. Some of my colleagues remember we had gasoline lines around the block. The public was mad. They were upset and blamed the Government. Their rhetoric and policy just doesn't match up. We are now in the year 2000 and we are on average in excess of 56 percent dependent on foreign imports.

Our Vice President also says we must increase our use of cleaner-burning natural gas to replace ''dirty coal.'' But his policy is to put the most promising areas for the discovery and production of natural gas off limits to exploration. I refer to another quote he made October 22 at a campaign appearance in Rye, NH. Our Vice President said: I will do everything in my power to make sure there is no new drilling, even in areas of the OCS already leased by previous administrations.

This is yet another example of what folks find confusing. Our Vice President, in his book, ''Earth in the Balance,'' wrote: Mining inffluent must return to the Earth as pure as they came.

But did you know that the Vice President, with his family, certainly don't follow this practice, pocketing $20,000 a year in mining royalties from the zinc mine on his Carthage, TN, property. He has pocketed $500,000 over the past 25 years. Considering this zinc mine has contaminated the banks of the Caney Fork River with heavy metal—that is in this general area. This is the Caney Fork River. This is the area that is concentrated with pollutants from the leaching field. This is the actual area where the mines are. This is the leaching field. This is the Gore complex above. They have had violations of clean water standards from time to time. It is clear that the mine does not meet standards set forth in the Vice President's book. I am sure however, that the royalty checks got cashed.

This is a picture that appeared in the June 30 Wall Street Journal cover article of this particular mine and the activities associated with it. I ask unanimous consent the article from the Wall Street Journal of June 30 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 30, 2000]

AL GORE, ENVIRONMENTALIST AND ZINC MINER

(By Micah Morrison)

''The lakes and rivers sustain us; they flow through the veins of the earth and into our own. But we must take care to let them flow back out as pure as they came, not poison and waste them without thought for the future.''—Al Gore, ''Earth in the Balance.''

''He taught me how to plow a steep hillside with a team of mules. He taught me how to clear three acres of heavily-wooded forest with a double-bladed axe. . . . He taught me how to stop gullies before they got started. He taught me how to drive, how to shoot a rifle, how to fish, how to swim. We loved to swim together in the Caney Fork River off a big flat rock on the back side of his farm.''—Al Gore on his father, Sen. Albert Gore Sr., from algore2000.com.

CARTHAGE, TENN.—On his most recent tax return, as he has the past 25 years. Vice President Al Gore lists a $20,000 mining royalty for the extraction of zinc from beneath his farm here in the bucolic hills of the Cumberland River Valley. In total, Mr. Gore has earned $500,000 from zinc royalties. His late father, the senator, introduced him not only to the double-bladed ax but also to Armand Hammer, chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corp., which sold the zinc-rich land to the Gore family in 1973.

It also seems that zinc from Mr. Gore's property ends up in the cool waters of the Caney Fork River, an oft-celebrated site in Gore lore. A major shaft and tailings pond of the Pasminco Zinc Mine sit practically in the backyard of the vice president's Tennessee homestead. Zinc and other metals from the Gore land move from underground tunnels through elaborate extraction processes. Waste material ends up in the tailings pond, from which water flows into adjacent Caney Fork, languidly rolling on to the great Cumberland.

MESSY BUSINESS

Mining is intrinsically a messy business, and Pasminco Zinc generally has a good environmental record. But not one that would pass muster with ''Earth in the Balance,'' Mr. Gore's best-selling environmental book. As recently as May 16, the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation issued a ''Notice of Violation.'' It informed Pasminco that it had infringed the Tennessee Water Quality Control act due to high levels of zinc in the river.

Those zinc levels exceeded standards established by the state and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. A ''sample analysis found that total zinc was 1.480 mg/L [milligrams per liter], which is greater than the monthly average of .65 mg/L and the daily maximum of 1.30 mg/L.'' Pasminco ''may be subject to enforcement action pursuant to The Tennessee Water Quality Control Act of 1977 for the aforementioned violation,'' the notice stated.

This was not the first time Mr. Gore's mining benefactor had run afoul of environmental regulations. In 1996, the mine twice failed biomonitoring tests designed to protect water quality in the Caney Fork for fish and wildlife. Mine discharge ''failed two acute tests for toxicity to Ceriodaphnia dubia,'' a species of water flea, according to a mine permit analysis by Tennessee environmental authorities. ''The discharge of industrial wastewater from Outfall #001 [the Caney Fork effluent] contains toxic metals (copper and zinc),'' the analysis stated. ''The combined effect of these pollutants may be detrimental to fish and aquatic life.''

Tests for The Wall Street Journal by two independent Tennessee laboratories, showed trace amounts of zinc and other metals in the Caney Fork that were in compliance with federal standards. But soil tests revealed what one lab called problematic ''large quantities'' of heavy metals in the riverbank soil downstream of the Caney Fork effluent. In both sets of tests, samples of water and soil were provided to the labs by the Journal.

Soil samples drawn from the mine effluent and downstream ''contained large quantities of Barium, Iron, and Zinc, as well as smaller amounts of arsenic, Chromium and Lead,'' Warner Laboratories found in September. ''The soil from each of these sites seems to have some problems according to our findings. The levels of Barium, Iron and Zinc far exceed any report limit [a detection threshold within the testing system] and it should be noted that these results are extremely high compared to typical soil found in a populated neighborhood.''

Tests conducted in June by the Environmental Science Corp. found similar traces of heavy metals in the water and soil. The report found the soil samples to contain relatively high levels of ''Barium, Iron, Zinc, and several of the other metals, including Aluminum, Calcium and Magnesium.'' The ESC report also noted traces of cyanide in some water and soil samples.

Pasminco is not required to test soil along the banks of the Caney Fork. Both labs, while noting anomalies in the soil, believe the results do not warrant concern as environmental hazards. The water and soil clearly are not, however, ''as pure as they came,'' as Mr. Gore demands in ''Earth in the Balance.''

A 1998 study by the Environmental Working Group, a Washington-based organization, criticized the zinc-mining operation for purchasing a toxic waste that included sulfuric acid and reselling it as fertilizer. The mine buys acid waste from steel plants, uses it as purification agent in zinc processing, and then sells the waste to fertilizer companies, according to a report in the Tennessean, a Nashville newspaper. Most soil scientists say the procedure is safe.

Tennessee environmentalists disagree. Clearly, when you spread those types of chemicals around on a farm or on the land, you're going to get a lot of runoff,'' Brian McGuire, executive director of Tennessee Citizens Action told the Tennessean. ''So it's going to get into the water. We're poisoning ourselves.''

A Pasminco official noted that the mine has had few violations and works to uphold a ''very strict standard'' of environmental quality. The Gore campaign did not respond to requests for comment. But some Tennessee residents say Mr. Gore becomes testy when questioned about the zinc mine. Tom Gniewek, a retired chemical engineer from Camden, Tenn., has studied zinc mine for years and tried to question Mr. Gore about it at town-hall meetings. ''He gets real angry,'' Mr. Gniewek says. ''Instead of answering the question, he attacked my motives and accused people like me of vandalizing the earth.''

Mr. Gore's original purchase of the zinc-rich land is of some interest as well, shedding light on his long relationship with Mr. Hammer, the former Occidental Petroleum chief. A controversial influence peddler who trafficked in politicians of all stripes and parties. Mr. Hammer pleaded guilty in 1975 to providing hush money in the Watergate scandal.

Mr. Hammer cut a wide swath across Washington from the 1930s until his death in 1990 at 92. His controversial career was marked by decades of profitable business dealings with the Soviet Union, which were closely watched by the FBI. He leapt into the big time by acquiring Libyan oil rights for Occidental Petroleum through what biographer Edward Jay Epstein has characterized as a combination of shrewd business dealings and bribery. After his 1975 conviction, Mr. Hammer spent the rest of his life campaigning for a pardon, which President Bush granted in 1989.

Mr. Hammer cultivated close relationships with many politicians, but he was closest to Mr. Gore's father, a U.S. senator from 1953 until 1971. Mr. Hammer's Occidental Minerals snapped up the zinc-bearing property in 1972. The senior Mr. Gore's farm is on the opposite bank of the Caney Fork. Mr. Hammer paid $160,000, double the only other offer, according to the Washington Post, which first disclosed details of the arrangement during the 1992 presidential campaign.

According to deed documents in Carthage, a year later Mr. Hammer sold the land to the senior Mr. Gore for $160,000, adding the extremely generous $20,000 per year mineral royalty. Ten minutes after that sale, the former senator executed a deed selling the property, including the mineral rights, to his son, the future vice president, for $140,000. Albert Gore Sr. told the Post he kept the first $20,000 royalty for himself, evening up the father-son transaction.

The purpose of the sale appears to have been transferring the annual $20,000 payment from Mr. Hammer to the young Mr. Gore. The Post reported that the ''$20,000 a year amounts to $227 an acre, much more than the $30 an acre Occidental Minerals, part of Hammer's oil company, paid the senior Gore and some neighbors a few years before the 1973 arrangement.''

In 1992 then-Sen. Gore told the Post that although he had been working for ''slave wages'' as a newspaper reporter, he quickly came up with a $40,000 down payment from two previous real-estate investments. In 1974, the zinc mine began annual payments of $20,000 to Mr. Gore, an important source of income to the young politician for many years.

After the senior Mr. Gore lost his 1970 Senate re-election bid, Mr. Hammer named him chairman of Island Creek Coal, an Occidental subsidiary, and appointed him to the board of directors of Occidental Petroleum. The late Mr. Gore's estate is conservatively valued at $1.5 million, including a block of Occidental stock worth between $250,000 and $500,000. The vice president is executor and trustee of his father's estate, with ''sole discretion'' to manage a trust on his mother's behalf.

As Albert Gore Jr. rose through the political ranks, Mr. Hammer continued to assist him. The Hammer family and corporations made donations up to the legal maximum in all of Mr. Gore's campaigns, according to Mr. Hammer's former personal assistant, Neil Lyndon, writing in London's Daily Telegraph. Mr. Gore regularly dined with Mr. Hammer and Occidental lobbyists in Washington, Mr. Lyndon wrote. ''Separately and together, the Gores sometimes used Hammer's luxurious private Boeing 727 for journeys and jaunts.'' The former Hammer aide noted that the ''profound and prolonged involvement between Hammer and Gore has never been revealed or investigated.''

Mr. Hammer was famous for his dealings with the Soviet Union, and received a humanitarian award in Moscow in 1987 from International Physicians Against Nuclear War. Mr. Gore, who had been elected to the Senate in 1984, delivered a speech to the same convention, saying conventional arms should be cut along with nuclear weapons. As vice president, Mr. Gore became the Clinton administration point man on relations with Russia.

MORE HYPOCRISY

Mr. Gore would be well served to get the facts out about his relationship with Mr. Hammer, beginning with the zinc bounty. The issue is bigger than whether there is a pollution problem in Tennessee. When Mr. Gore's zinc riches are at stake, he appears unwilling to live by the standards he sets out for others in ''Earth in the Balance.''

His record of uncompromising environmental rhetoric seems another instance of the kind of hypocrisy that has dogged his campaign for months. He's been accused of being a slumlord for providing substandard housing to a tenant on a rental unit adjoining his farm. A well-remembered 1996 speech to the Democratic National Convention, invoking his sister's death by lung cancer and attacking the tobacco industry, also contributed to his reputation for slippery sanctimony when his close ties to Tennessee tobacco were revealed. And of course Mr. Gore has been sharply criticized for posturing on campaign finance reform while under investigation for possible fund-raising crimes in the 1996 campaign.

No mention of the zinc mine appears in ''Earth in the Balance,'' on Mr. Gore's campaign Web site or in his speeches. At this point the story of the Tennessee farm, the zinc mine, the politician and the influence peddler is largely one of cant and hypocrisy. This is not a hanging crime in the political world, but the vice president, among others, might note that Bill Clinton's problems also began with a murky land deal and a shady financier.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Again, it is not my desire to criticize somebody because they own a mine or have a resource interest, but there is a certain criticism when one recognizes the reality that this mine is hardly a model for anyone, based on the number of violations that have been filed in Tennessee over an extended period of time on this particular mine.

We know the Vice President has been critical of some; namely George W. Bush, for his close ties to big oil. In fact, the Vice President's family has close historical ties to Occidental Petroleum and shares in that company which, in its public disclosure, is valued between $500,000 to $1 million. Occidental Petroleum plans to drill in the ancestral lands of over 5,000 U'wa Indians in the Colombia rain forest. They threatened suicide if Occidental goes forward with its plans.

I ask unanimous consent an article from the June 26 Washington Times that substantiates that allegation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCIDENTAL DEAL BENEFITS GORES—SALE OF FEDERAL OIL FIELD BOOSTS FAMILY FORTUNE

(By Bill Sammon)

Vice President Al Gore's push to privatize a federal oil field added tens of thousands of dollars to the value of oil stock owned by the Gore family, which has been further enriched by skyrocketing gasoline prices.

Shares of Occidental Petroleum jumped 10 percent after the company purchased the Elk Hills oil field in California from the federal government in 1998. Mr. Gore, whose family owns at least $500,000 in Occidental stock, recommended the sale as part of his ''reinventing government'' reform package.

The sale, which constituted the largest privatization of federal land in U.S. history,

transformed Occidental from a lackluster financial performer into a dynamic profit-spewing, oil giant. Having instantly tripled its U.S. oil reserves, the company began pumping out vast sums of crude at low cost.

As the months went by, Occidental was able to sell the oil, which ends up at gasoline retail outlets like Union 76, for more profit. Rising oil prices have significantly improved Occidental's bottom line, said analyst Christopher Stavros of Paine Webber.

This year, the company posted first quarter revenues of $2.5 billion, or 87 percent higher than a year earlier. That's a bigger increase than at nine of 10 other oil companies listed in a survey that Mr. Gore cited last week as evidence of price gouging.

The rise in Occidental oil prices, coupled with the acquisition of the Elk Hills field, has paid handsome dividends for the Gore family.

The vice president recently updated his financial disclosure form to put the value of this family's Occidental stock at between $500,000 and $1 million. Prior to the Elk Hills sale and gasoline price spike, Mr. Gore had listed the value of the stock at between $250,000 and $500,000.

Gore aides insist the vice president's push to sell Elk Hills does not constitute a conflict of interest. They point out the family's Occidental shares were originally owned by Mr. Gore's father, who died in 1998, leaving the stock in an estate for which the vice president serves as executor.

Although Mr. Gore continues to list the stock on his financial disclosure forms, aides said the shares are in a trust for the vice president's mother, Pauline.

''He doesn't own stock because he's trying to avoid conflicts of interest,'' said Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway. ''He's the executor of the estate, but he's not the trustee of the trust. It's a separate thing.''

Still, Mr. Gore's recommendation to privatize Elk Hills ended up enriching his mother, who is expected to eventually bequeath the stock to the vice president, her sole heir.

Last week, Mr. Gore began a concerted effort to blame skyrocketing gasoline prices not only on ''big oil'' but also on Texas Gov. George W. Bush. Gore aides have emphasized that Mr. Bush once ran several oil-exploration firms and has accepted more campaign contributions from oil companies than the vice president.

The Texas governor has dismissed the attacks as an attempt to divert attention away from Mr. Gore's energy and environmental policies, which have driven up gasoline prices. Political analysts say the spiraling gas prices could imperil Mr. Gore's presidential bid because they are highest in the Midwest, which he must carry in order to win the White House.

The political and financial fortunes of the Gore family were established largely with oil money from Occidental's founder, Armand Hammer. Part capitalist and part communist, Mr. Hammer became the elder Gore's patron more than half a century ago, showering him with riches and nurturing his political career through the House and Senate.

The elder Gore enthusiastically returned the favors. In the early 1960s, Sen. Gore took to the Senate floor to defend Mr. Hammer against FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who wanted to investigate Mr. Hammer's Soviet ties.

In 1965, the elder Gore helped Mr. Hammer obtain a visa to Libya, where he opened oil fields that turned Occidental into a multinational powerhouse.

When the elder Mr. Gore lost his re-election bid in 1970, Mr. Hammer installed him as head of an Occidental subsidiary and gave him a $500,000 annual salary. The man who had begun his career as a struggling schoolteacher in rural Tennessee ended it as a millionaire oil tycoon.

The younger Gore also benefited from Mr. Hammer's generosity. He was paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual payments of $20,000 for mineral rights to a parcel of land near the family's homestead in Tennessee that Occidental never bothered mining.

When the younger Gore first ran for president in 1988, Mr. Hammer promised former Sen. Paul Simon ''any Cabinet spot I wanted'' if he would withdraw from the primary, according to a 1989 book by the Illinois Democrat.

Mr. Gore and his wife, Tipper, once flew in Mr. Hammer's private jet across the Atlantic Ocean. They hosted Mr. Hammer, at several presidential inaugurations and remained close to the oilman until his death in 1990.

In 1992, when Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton was considering Mr. Gore as his running mate, the elder Gore wrote a memo describing his son's ties to Mr. Hammer. The document was designed to provide Mr. Clinton with answers to possible questions from reporters.

Mr. Hammer's successor at Occidental, Ray Irani, has continued to funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars into the campaigns of Mr. Gore and the Democratic Party. For example, two days after spending the night in the Lincoln Bedroom in 1996, he cut a check for $100,000 to the Democratic Party.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have heard that the Vice President and the administration tried to stop drilling in Alaska with expressions of concern for the G'wichin Indians, some of which reside in Alaska, and others which reside in Canada.

But has he spoken out for the U'was in Colombia? Is there an inconsistency here? On the one hand, he allows, and evidently ignores, the drilling in the Colombia rain forest on leases owned by Occidental Petroleum, and he seems to have no objection. But in an area the G'wichin Indians in Alaska depend on for subsistence, a significant area which is in the purview of the Senate to make decisions for opening, he does not support oil and gas exploration. My point is, there is an inconsistency here.

The weight of their policy as it twists and reinvents itself is a mystery to me as I try to summon a clear vision of their intent. His beliefs are a confusing world of images and contradictions. I suspect it might be difficult for others, as well.

f

PROJECTS ON GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am also going to take the opportunity to address an issue that some time ago my Committee on Energy and Natural Resources asked the General Accounting Office to provide a detailee to conduct a preliminary inquiry into payments made by the Project On Government Oversight to two Federal officials. The Project On Government Oversight is known as ''POGO.'' This report was received by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It was prepared by Paul Thompson, the detailee from the General Accounting Office. It is dated July 2000.

There is no question in my mind after reviewing this that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior should be required to review this report and respond to our Committee. I think it is fitting that the Attorney General, Janet Reno, address and resolve some of the questions that are raised by the inquiry.

Let me share some of them. I read as follows from the report of the POGO on July 2000.

CONCLUSIONS

It appears that POGO paid the two Federal officials in connection with their activities to influence the Department toward taking actions and adopting policies that, among other things, (a) directly and indirectly assisted POGO in a project involving matters in which these two individuals were substantially involved as Federal employees and that led to POGO's filing of a lawsuit through which it and the two officials received substantial sums of money and stand to receive potentially millions of dollars more, and (b) benefited the professional and business interests of POGO's chairman and a client of his law firm. The circumstances associated with the payments raised the possibility that the Department of the Interior's development of the policy underlying the new oil royalty regulations may have been improperly influenced by expectations or understandings of the officials that they could personally benefit from using their positions as Federal employees to assist POGO and two of its principals. The officials were substantially involved in key stages of the Department's policy development process in ways that served the interests of the POGO's chairman and its executive director. Whether the payments and circumstances under which they were made could serve to erode confidence in the Department's administration of the royalty management program is a well grounded concern.

Madam President, the entire transcript of the committee report on POGO, prepared for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, is available from the committee's website at http://www.energy.senate.gov.

f

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO H.R. 4461

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following technical corrections at the desk to various amendments to the Agriculture appropriations bill be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The corrections are as follows:

Change the instruction on amendment #3970 to read: ''On page 76, after line 5, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3068 to read: ''On page 76, after line 5, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3457 to read: ''On page 85, after line 8, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3958 to read: ''On page 100, after line 12, insert:''.

Change the instruction on amendment #3985 to read: ''On page 95, after line 22, insert:''.

On page 55, line 22, strike ''$1,216,796,000'' and insert $1,210,796,000''.

In amendment #4003, on page 2, line 9, insert ''90''.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 25. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee, 9:30 to 10 a.m.; Senator THOMAS or his designee, 10 to 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, when the Senate convenes at 9:30 a.m., the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m. As a reminder to all Senators, cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and on the motion to proceed to the intelligence authorization bill earlier today. Therefore, under the rule, those votes will occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Wednesday.

f

ORDER FOR STATEMENTS IN MEMORY OF SENATOR COVERDELL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Further, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, the time from 9:30 a.m. until 11 a.m. be designated for Senators to make statements in memory of our dear friend, the late Senator Paul Coverdell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Under the provisions of S. Res. 341, statements made on Thursday or prior to Thursday in regard to our colleague's death will be bound and given to Mrs. Coverdell.

f

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:14 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF FRED BITTERMAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise at this time to recognize the remarkable life and significant achievements of a distinguished public servant and friend of mine, Captain Fred Bitterman. Tragically, Fred passed away Tuesday night in an accident at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Captain Bitterman, a dedicated law enforcement officer, father, grandfather and friend, will be deeply missed.

For over twenty five years Captain Bitterman served the people of the State of Colorado first as a State Patrolman, and later as a Troop Commander and Captain in the Colorado State Patrol. Captain Bitterman supervised a region that included the cities of Parachute, Vail, Eagle, New Castle, Carbondale, and of course our hometown of Glenwood Springs. As a law enforcement officer, his professionalism elevated him into a position of leadership. Captain Bitterman commanded a deep sense of admiration and respect from those officers who had the privilege of working alongside him, and also from those whom he worked so diligently to protect.

Captain Bitterman also put forth an immense effort to serving the public in his professional life. Captain Bitterman distinguished himself with his service to the Colorado State Patrol. Captain Bitterman enjoyed a well-deserved reputation of integrity not only within the ranks of the state patrol, but within the community as well.

Captain Bitterman was a strong family man, who took great pride in the family that he shared with his wife Cathy. In addition to Cathy, Captain Bitterman is survived by his six children, and many grandchildren. Captain Bitterman's passing is a severe loss not only to his family, but to our community as well.

Captain Bitterman was a very, very good man.

CONDEMNING 1994 ATTACK ON AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 531, condemning the 1994 attack of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Six years have passed since this senseless, but very tragic act of violence.

The Jewish people of Argentina make up the largest Jewish community in Latin America. On July 18, 1994, the AMIA Jewish Community Center was bombed in Buenos Aires. As a result 86 people lost their lives and 300 were injured.

This resolution calls upon President Fernando de la Rua to continue the investigation of the bombing, an investigation in which no person primarily responsible for this crime has been brought to justice. Argentine officials have acknowledged that this investigation was filled with negligence, and led to the arrest of just a few people tied to the incident, but who were only charged with providing a stolen vehicle used in the attack.

Investigators for the South American government have stated that the evidence indicates the bombing was carried out by the Iranian sponsored terrorist group Hezbollah. They have also found that the bombing could not have been carried out absent the assistance of local Argentine security forces, which have been reported to be compassionate to anti-Semitic rhetoric.

The democratic leaders of the Western Hemisphere have denounced terrorism in all its forms and have pledged to jointly combat terrorist acts anywhere in the Americas. The United States is not immune to acts of terrorism and this resolution serves to reiterate the long-standing policy of our country to stand firm against terrorist attacks wherever and whenever they occur and to work with its allies to ensure that justice is given to the victims and that the perpetrators of such violence are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

In order to fully live up to this policy we must lend our support to the government of Argentina. As I said previously, the evidence indicates that insiders played a major role in executing this violence. What security is available to the people of Argentina when the officers who pledged to uphold the law commit crimes against the people they are supposed to protect?

Terrorism effectively destroys the peaceful and civilized coexistence of all people. The United States cannot turn its back on such acts no matter where they take place. Failure to punish terrorists would be to reward them and to encourage the spread of violence in our homeland and abroad. This is not the impression the United States Government wants to give to the American people, nor to anyone around the world.

Terrorists ignore existing rules of law and endanger the stability of democratically elected constitutional governments. Terrorism is a serious form of organized and systematic violence, intended to generate chaos and fear among the people and results in death and destruction. Terrorist acts are acts of hate carried out on individuals because of the difference of their religion, the color of their skin or their political beliefs. When we ignore the acts of people that wreak havoc on others because of their differences, it is a negative reflection of the values of America as a whole. Terrorist acts are immoral and should never be condoned by the United States or any other government.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to urge the Argentina government to fulfill its international obligations and its promise to the Argentine people by vigorously pursuing all persons involved in the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 2000, due to a scheduling conflict, I was unable to be present on the House floor during the vote on H.R. 4871 and its amendments. Had I been here I would have voted in the following manner:

''No'' on rollcall 428; ''aye'' on rollcall 427; ''no'' on rollcall 426; ''no'' on rollcall 425; ''no'' on rollcall 424; ''aye'' on rollcall 423; ''no'' on rollcall 422; and ''aye'' on rollcall 421.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 2000

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, as a father of young, working children, with working spouses, I am concerned that our tax system is penalizing them, and over 42,000 other working couples in my district, for making the sacrifices necessary to support their families.

Our tax system create penalties for being married in different ways. The tax laws do not allow married couples to earn twice as much taxable income as single taxpayers before higher tax rates take effect. The higher rates mean that spouses earn less after taxed than if they were single. The standard deduction for a single taxpayer is currently $4,300. But for married couple the standard deduction is not doubled to $8,600—it is only $7,200. Millions of middle class working families who don't itemize deductions wind up paying a penalty because they are married.

Whatever form it takes, the ''marriage penalty'' is a tax bias against the working spouse with lower earnings. This means it is disproportionately a tax bias against working women taxpayers. Is this tax fairness? Married working women see a higher tax bite than their single counterparts because our tax laws fail to tax them on the same footing as single taxpayers. It's time to stop punishing working Americans. We encourage Americans to work, and we encourage single mothers and fathers to marry to benefit their children, and now we are fixing the tax system so that it makes marriage affordable. I urge you to pass this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, due to business in Colorado, I was unable to vote on the Hostettler amendment to H.R. 4871, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (Roll No. 427). Had I been able to vote, I would have voted ''yea.''

INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a topic that surrounds the dynamic questions raised by the extensive growth and reach of the internet. The information superhighway and the entire technological revolution have forced the Congress and industry officials to reexamine the regulation of internet gambling.

Under current federal law, it is unclear that using Internet to operate a gambling business is illegal. Gambling over the Internet only represents nefarious activity that we must only carefully examine, but such gambling also perpetuates the addictive nature of gambling.

It is well known that many gamblers are compulsive gamblers. In other words, they fell compelled to gamble, just as many smokers feel compelled to smoke cigarettes. Access fuels such additions, and by providing gambling sites over the Internet, illegal entities create access to anyone who owns a computer with a modem.

On-Line casino operators have created ''virtual strip''—where gamblers who are tired of one casino can simply ''walk'' down the virtual Internet boardwalk into a different casino. Internet gambling sites offer everything from sports betting to blackjack. Many of these are operated from offshore locations. It is significant to note that H.R. 3125 would impose a mandate on Internet service providers by requiring them to offer their residential customers filtering software that would block access by children to gambling Internet sites. It is crucial that we protect our children from such activity.

Given the fact that the majority of our citizens have access to computers and the Internet, we must ensure that the Internet is used for the right reasons such as education and communication. We cannot forget that people utilize the Internet in a global marketplace of ideas.

This measure prohibits a person from knowingly using the Internet or any other interactive service to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager with any other person. H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 2000, would prohibit persons engaged in a gambling business from using the Internet or any other interactive computer service place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager, or send, receive, or invite information assisting in the placing of a bet or wager.

More importantly, the bill addresses not only individual gamblers, but also gambling businesses. For those gambling businesses that choose to participate in Internet gambling, they face fines up to $20,000 or imprisonment (up to 4 years).

This bill would also require common carriers and Internet services to assist federal, state, and local enforcement agencies in shutting down illegal betting or wagering sites.

We must toe the line when we enforce this measure. We do not want to trample upon the privacy rights of individuals. However, as long as the enforcement of a ''gambling business'' defined the legislation is not expanded by law enforcement authorities, it will help protect many parties from destructive and illegal conduct.

We must adopt a model of enforcement that provides uniformity and specificity so that the Internet carriers and telephone companies can easily and efficiently remove gambling sites from the Internet. It is my expectation that this legislation, after reconciliation with S. 692, the Senate-version of this bill, will make a positive contribution to the regulation of gambling businesses.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE EARLY ACCESS AND TAX CREDIT ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, more and more people in this country are losing access to health insurance. A new study by the Urban Institutes that the percentage of people under 65 without health insurance in 1998 grew to a stunning 18.4 percent. And, as the study's authors highlight, the strong national economy is masking what would otherwise be an even greater problem.

There are many approaches to solutions for decreasing the number of uninsured. As most of my colleagues are aware, I support the creation of a universal health care system in which each and every American would have health insurance coverage. That is the most fair, affordable, and sustainable solution to our national health care needs.

However, that won't be accomplished overnight. In the meantime, there are steps that Congress can and should be taking to develop immediate, if smaller, solutions to providing people affordable health insurance coverage options.

One such is to pass legislation that would provide certain groups of individuals the option of buying into Medicare. For two sessions of Congress, we have sponsored a bill endorsed by the President called the Medicare Early Access Act. The goal of this legislation is to expand access to Medicare's purchasing power to certain individuals below age 65.

The Medicare Early Access Act is self-financed, through enrollees' premiums; it is not a publicly financed program. It simply would enable eligible individuals to harness Medicare's clout in the marketplace to get much more affordable health coverage than they are able to purchase in the private sector market that currently exists.

The bill would provide a very vulnerable population (age 55–64) with three new options to obtain health insurance:

Individuals 62–65 years old with no access to health insurance could buy into Medicare by paying a base premium (about $326 a month) during those pre-Medicare eligibility years and a deferred premium during their post-65 Medicare enrollment (about $4 per month in 2005 for an individual who participated in the full 3 years of the new program). The deferred premium is designed to reimburse Medicare for the extra costs due to the fact that sicker than average people are likely to enroll in the program. The deferred premium would be payable out of the enrollee's Social Security check between the ages of 65–85.

Individuals 55–62 years old who have been laid off and have no access to health insurance, as well as their spouse, could buy into Medicare by paying a monthly premium (about $460 a month). There would be no deferred premium. Certain eligibility requirements would apply.

Retirees aged 55 or older whose employer-sponsored coverage is terminated could buy into their employee's health insurance for active workers at 125 percent of the group rate. This would be a COBRA expansion, with no relationship to Medicare.

Today, we are here to introduce a new, improved version of this legislation. As we are all aware, there are new projections of vast budget surpluses in our Nation's future. We want to take a small portion of those monies and finance a new component of the Medicare Early Access Act. Our new bill, the Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act of 2000 supplements our previous proposal by incorporating a new 25 percent tax credit that would be attached to each of the three programs. Thus, the actual cost to taxpayers would be 25 percent less than the cost under the proposals in the existing bill. I join today with more than 50 of my colleagues to reintroduce this new version of the legislation.

Affordability is a key component of expanding health insurance coverage. Adding a tax credit to the programs increases their affordability so that more people age 55 and older can take advantage of the program. The latest analysis from the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, indicate that more than 500,000 currently uninsured people would gain health insurance coverage by enactment of the Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act.

The Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act isn't the total solution for people age 55–64 who lack access to health insurance coverage. However, if passed, it would make available health insurance options for these individuals at much less than the cost of what is available today. This is a meaningful step forward in expanding health insurance coverage to a segment of our population that is quickly losing coverage in the private sector. The Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act is legislation that we should be able to agree upon and to enact so that people aged 55–64 have a new, viable option for health insurance coverage.

I submit a more detailed summary of the Medicare Early Access and Tax Credit Act as follows:

MEDICARE EARLY ACCESS AND TAX CREDIT ACT

Title I: Help For People Aged 62 to 65

62–65 YEAR OLDS WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE MAY BUY INTO MEDICARE BY PAYING MONTHLY PREMIUMS AND REPAYING ANY EXTRA COSTS TO MEDICARE THROUGH DEFERRED PREMIUMS BETWEEN AGES 65 TO 85

Starting July, 2001, the full range of Medicare benefits (Part A & B and Medicare+Choice plans) may be bought by an individual between 62–65 who has earned enough quarters of coverage to be eligible for Medicare at age 65 and who has no health insurance under a public plan or a group plan. (The individual does not need to have exhausted any employer COBRA eligibility).

A person may continue to buy-into Medicare even if they subsequently become eligible for an employer group health plan or public plan. Individuals move into regular Medicare at age 65.

Financing: Enrollees must pay premiums. Premiums are divided into two parts:

(1) Base Premiums of about $326 a month payable during months of enrollment between 62 to 65, which will be adjusted for inflation and will vary a little by differences in the cost of health care in various geographic regions, and

(2) Deferred Premiums which will be payable between age 65–85, and which are estimated to be about $4 per month in 2005 for someone that participated for the full three years. The Deferred Premium will be paid like the current Part B premium, i.e., out of one's Social Security check.

Note, the Base Premium will be adjusted from year to year to reflect changing costs (and individuals will be told that number each year before they choose to enroll), but the 20 year Deferred Premium will not change from the dollar figure that the beneficiary is told when they first enroll between 62–65—they will be able to count on a specific dollar deferred payment figure.

The Base Premium equals the premium that would be necessary to cover all costs if all 62–65 year olds enrolled in the program. The Deferred Premium repays Medicare for the fact that not all will enroll, but that many sicker than average people are likely to voluntarily enroll. The Deferred Premiums ensure that the program is eventually fully financed over roughly 20 years. Savings from the anti-fraud proposals (introduced separately as HR 2229) finance the start-up of the program and protect the existing Medicare program against any loss (see Title IV).

Title II: Help For 55 to 62 Year Olds Who Lose Their Jobs

55–62 YEAR OLDS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (AND THEIR UNINSURED SPOUSES) MAY BUY INTO MEDICARE THROUGH A PREMIUM

The full range of Medicare benefits may be bought by an individual between 55–62 who:

(1) has earned enough quarters of coverage to be eligible for Medicare at age 65,

(2) is eligible for unemployment insurance,

(3) before lay-off had a year-plus of employment-based health insurance, and

(4) because of the unemployment no longer has such coverage or eligibility for COBRA coverage.

A worker's spouse who meets the above conditions (except for UI eligibility) and is younger than 62 may also buy-in (even if younger than 55).

The worker and spouse must terminate buy-in if they become eligible for other types of insurance, but if the conditions listed above reoccur, they are eligible to buy-in again. At age 62 they must terminate and can convert to the Title I program. Non-payment of premiums is also cause for termination.

There is a single monthly premium roughly equal to $460 that will be adjusted for inflation. It must be paid during the time of buy-in; there is no Deferred Premium. This premium is set to recover base costs plus some of the costs created by the likely enrollment of sicker than average people. The rest of the costs to Medicare are repaid by the anti-fraud provisions (see Title IV).

Title III: Help for Workers 55+ Whose Retiree Benefits are Terminated

WORKERS AGE 55+ WHOSE RETIREMENT HEALTH INSURANCE IS TERMINATED BY THEIR EMPLOYER MAY BUY INTO THEIR EMPLOYER'S HEALTH INSURANCE FOR ACTIVE WORKERS AT 125% OF THE GROUP RATE (THIS IS AN EXTENSION OF COBRA HEALTH CONTINUATION COVERAGE—NOT A MEDICARE PROGRAM)

This Title is an expansion of the COBRA health continuation benefits program. If a worker and dependents have relied on a company retiree health benefit plan, and that protection is terminated or substantially slashed during his or her retirement, but the company continues a health plan for its active workers, then the retiree may buy-into the company's group health plan at 125% of cost. They can remain in that plan, paying 125% of the premium, until they are eligible for Medicare at age 65.

Title IV: Financing

Titles I & II of the Early Access to Medicare Act are totally financed. Title III is not a Medicare or public program.

The existing Medicare program is protected by placing these programs in their own trust fund. The Medicare Trustees will monitor the program to ensure that it is self-financing and does not in any way burden the existing Medicare program.

Most of the cost is paid by the enrollees' premiums.

Payment of start up costs: While the Deferred Premiums are being collected and for any costs not covered by premiums, a package of Medicare anti-fraud, waste, and abuse provisions has been introduced as a separate bill, the Medicare Fraud and Overpayment Act of 1999. This bill provides for a number of reforms, including:

(1) improvements in the Medicare Secondary Payment provisions,

(2) a reduction in Medicare's reimbursement for the drug EPO used with kidney dialysis so that Medicare is not paying much more than the dialysis centers are buying the drug for;

(3) Medicare payment for pharmaceuticals, biologicals, or parenteral nutrients on the basis of actual acquisition cost rather than the average wholesale price which is often far above the price at which the drug can really be purchased,

(4) setting quality standards for the partial hospitalization mental health benefit, so as to weed out unqualified, abusive providers, and

(5) allowing Medicare to get a volume discount by contracting with Centers of Excellence for high volumes of complex operations at hospitals which have better than average outcomes.

Title V: Tax Credits

Creates a new, federal tax credit equal to 25% of the amount paid by an individual for any of the three new programs described above.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, my Colleagues, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4461, the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill. The provisions of this bill reflect the wrong priorities. The measure's total funding is $524 million less than it was last year. These cuts not only gravely impact the health of our children, but they also harm our environment.

Most importantly, the bill rejects funding for the Food and Drug Administration's tobacco program. Congress must give the FDA the authority to regulate tobacco. I have worked hard to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco, and I cannot support a bill that contains such an ill conceived provision.

In addition, the Agriculture Appropriations bill underfunds a number of important programs for children and families, the environment, and consumers. The Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program is cut substantially below the President's request. This essential program saves our most vulnerable children from disease and starvation by providing infants and children with nutritious food to help them thrive during critical years of development. Additionally, funding for state water quality grant programs received less than half of the requested funding level. Another underfunded program is the Food Safety Initiative, which would minimize contamination and ensure consumer food safety.

My Colleagues, it is up to us to make sure that programs that are important to the health and safety of the children and families we represent are safeguarded. The Agriculture Appropriations legislation has its priorities reversed. For that reason, I could not support H.R. 4461, the Fiscal Year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill in its current form.

LT. COMMANDER CHARLES A. SCHUE III RETIRES

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize the achievements of a great man, who, through his impressive leadership skills and dedication to both his country and the United States Coast Guard, has forever raised the bar of excellence for those who must follow in his footsteps.

July 21, 2000 marks the retirement of Lieutenant Commander Charles A. Schue, III, United States Coast Guard, as well as the Change of Command at the Coast Guard Loran Support Unit (LSU) in Wildwood, New Jersey. On July 21, 2000, Lieutenant Commander Schue will relinquish command of the unit he has so ably commanded for the last three years. He will then retire after more than 26 years of honorable and meritorious service with the United States Coast Guard.

After attending Coast Guard Boot Camp in Cape May, New Jersey, Lieutenant Commander Schue quickly rose through the enlisted ranks to become a Commissioned Warrant Officer in just 10 years. His tours of duty with the Coast Guard took him across the nation and the world, from Southern New Jersey to Alaska, from Marcus Island, Japan, to Monterey, California, and then, appropriately, back to Southern New Jersey. While serving on Long Range Aids to Navigation (LORAN) transmitter and control stations, Lieutenant Commander Schue helped provide vital radionavigation services to the United States and Asia.

Despite isolated tours of duty and numerous changes of duty stations, Lieutenant Commander Schue continued his professional growth and easily gained entrance to the Coast Guard Officer Candidate School. Not content to merely assume the trappings of being an officer, Lieutenant Commander Schue continued his professional growth, earning both a Master of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Naval Postgraduate School and a Master of Science Degree in Engineering Management from Western New England College. Lieutenant Commander Schue's superior engineering and leadership skills were formally recognized when he was named the Coast Guard's Engineer of the Year for 1999.

As Commanding Officer of the LSU, Lieutenant Commander Schue expertly led and motivated a team of office, enlisted, and civilian, and contractor personnel, which consistently produced results of the highest quality, as was highlighted when LSU received the Secretary of Transportation's Team Award for the Loran Consolidated Control System. Setting the standard for responsiveness, and using innovative engineering solutions despite the scarcity of parts and funding, he was instrumental in keeping 1960's and 1970's vintage Loran electronics equipment operational well beyond its planned lifecycle. The LSU's superb support of the $65.4 M North American Loran-C system resulted in a near 100 percent availability for this safety-of-life navigation system during his tour as the Commanding Officer.

Upon his retirement, his award citation from the Commandant of the Coast Guard noted that ''Lieutenant Commander Schue was the driving force behind the Loran Support Unit solidifying its position as the international leader in the Loran-C systems technology'' and further stated that ''Lieutenant Commander Schue's ability, diligence, and devotion to duty are most heartily commended and are in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Coast Guard.''

I wish to extend my appreciation to Lieutenant Commander Schue for his service to the United States of America and I wish him, his wife Lori and their two children, Ian and Tia a wonderful future.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GERIATRIC WORKFORCE RELIEF ACT OF 2000

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the complex health problems of aging require specially-trained physicians in order to adequately care for frail older persons. Geriatrics is the medical specialty that promotes wellness and preventive care; these specialists are first board certified in family practice, internal medicine or psychiatry and then complete additional years of fellowship training in geriatrics. With an emphasis on care management and coordination, geriatricians help patients maintain functional independence, thus improving their overall quality of life. An emphasis on coordination also limits unnecessary and costly hospitalization or institutionalization.

Despite the increasing number of Americans over age 65, there are fewer than 9,000 geriatricians in the United States today. In Texas, there are only about 225 geriatricians—and we are one of the top ten states nationally. Texas has four geriatric training programs; Baylor College of medicine in Houston, the University of Texas at San Antoino, the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (where, I am proud to say, my daughter is a third-year student) and the University of Texas Southwestern.

The Baylor program, in my Congressional District, has been operating for over 15 years. It trains six fellows now and is unable to increase this number because of a Congressionally-mandated Graduate Medical Education (GME) cap. I am told that there are plenty of applicants interested in geriatrics who are being turned away because our Medicare program will not allow them to be funded.

Why is there a cap on the number of new geriatricians? The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 established a hospital-specific cap based upon the number of residents in the hospital in the most recent cost reporting period ending on or before December 31, 1996. Under the cap, the number of residents for direct graduate medical education payment purposes is based upon a three-year rolling average, except for Fiscal Year 1998, when a two-year average was used.

The implementation of this cap has adversely impacted geriatric programs in Houston and elsewhere. As geriatrics is a relatively new specialty, the cap has resulted in either the elimination or reduction of geriatric programs. Because a lower number of geriatric residents existed prior to December 31, 1996, these programs are under-represented in the cap baseline. Thus, new geriatric training programs are severely limited and existing training programs tend not to increase funding, or even decrease funding, for geriatric slots.

There is a well-documented shortage of geriatricians nationwide. Of the approximately 98,000 medical residency and fellowship positions supported by Medicare in 1998, only 324 were in geriatric medicine and geriatric psychiatry.

At the same time, the number of physicians needed to provide medical care for older persons has been estimated to be 2.5 to three time higher in 2030 compared to the mid-1980s, according to the federal Health Resources and Services Administration.

Unfortunately, the pace of training is not meeting this need. The actual number of certified geriatricians has declined, as approximately 50% of those who certified in 1988 did not recertify in 1998. This has occurred just as the baby boomers have started reaching the age of Medicare eligibility.

To correct this problem, I am introducing the Geriatric Workforce Relief Act of 2000 today to allow an increase in the number of person studying geriatrics at our medical schools. In order to be fiscally responsible, my legislation does not completely lift the cap. Instead, it allows hospitals to increase the cap by 30%. This will allow for a few more students at most programs. My legislation defines approved geriatric residency programs as those approved by the Accreditation Council of Graduate Medical Education.

My legislation, which will also be introduced in the Senate today by Senator REID, is modeled upon a similar provisions that was enacted last year for rural hospitals. It is a sensible and reasonable proposal and one that allows us to meet the needs of Medicare patients. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

HONORING ROBERT DOLSEN UPON HIS RETIREMENT AS THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF MICHIGAN'S REGION IV AREA AGENCY ON AGING

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Robert Dolsen, upon his retirement after 26 years of dedicated service as the Executive Director of the Region IV Area Agency on Aging. Over the years, Bob has made a tremendous difference in the lives of thousands of elderly and their families in St. Joseph/Benton Harbor and surrounding communities. He has been a great community leader.

Bob established the Region IV Area Agency on Aging in 1974 as a small operation with a staff of four. Today, the Agency operates with a staff of 60 and a budget of over $10 million. Through the Agency, over 5,000 families are receiving the support services they need to maintain their independence through life's transitions and changes.

Bob has long recognized that one of the greatest challenges facing our community and our nation is the aging of our population and the need for long-term care services. He is providing great leadership on this issue. We are growing old—fast. Today, those 65 and over comprise 12 percent of our population. In just 30 years, those 65 and over will comprise nearly 20 percent of our population. One in five Americans will be a senior citizen. Rising to this challenge, Bob established the first demonstration project for Michigan's home-based long-term care system. It was successful and led to the State's initiation of a Medicaid waiver for home-based services and to the statewide replication of care management through Area Agencies on Aging.

Bob is recognized state-wide and nationally for his knowledge of aging issues, and especially long-term care. He has testified before Congressional committees on 9 different occasions, he is a frequent speaker and trainer at statewide and national conferences, and he was the 1992 recipient of the Harry J. Kelley Award from the Michigan Society of Gerontology for outstanding service in the development of policy and programs for older persons. He is a founding member of the Great Lakes Alliance, an interstate corporation to facilitate cooperation and communication on

age-related issues among six states, and he is a founding member of the Healthy Berrien Coalition, an initiative designed to mobilize key community resources to bring the health status of Berrien County's citizens up to or above national and state standards. Last year, it was my pleasure and honor to co-host a forum on Aging in America with the Coalition. Bob also serves on the Public Policy Committee of the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging and was on the Association's Board of Directors for 8 years. He is the past president and a current Board member for the Area Agencies on Aging Association of Michigan. In addition, Bob has served on the Board of the Michigan Society of Gerontology, the Statewide Health Coordinating Council, and the Governor's Long-term Care Task Force.

With all these responsibilities, Bob still finds the time and energy to serve on the United Way Allocation Committee, an advisory group recommending local United Way awards, and to actively participate in and be a benefactor of the St. Joseph-Benton Harbor Rotary Club.

Southwest Michigan is a much better place for all of its citizens, and especially for the elderly, because we have been blessed with Bob Dolsen. He has touched each of our lives in ways large and small, and always with a gentle grace. I know everyone in Southwest Michigan joins me in wishing Bob Dolsen well upon his retirement and in thanking him from our hearts for all he has done and is doing for our community.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK PHILLIP HAWS OF HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a friend and first-rate doctor, Dr. Frank Haws. As the friends, colleagues and family of Dr. Haws are gathering tonight to honor him, I fee that it is fitting that the United States Congress join them in paying homage to a man who has lent his knowledge, talents and skill to the medical community of North Alabama for over 36 years.

Originally from Washington County, Tennessee and educated at his birth state's institutions of East Tennessee State and the University of Tennessee at Memphis, Dr. Haws began his neurosurgery practice in Huntsville in 1964. He has spent the past 36 years dedicating himself to improving medical care for Huntsville and the surrounding areas. A superior surgeon, Dr. Haws shares his expertise with young doctors teaching at the medical schools of the University of Alabama at Huntsville, the University of Alabama at Birmingham and the University of Tennessee. He has also channeled his experience and skill into premier academic publications including the Southern Medical Journal.

In 1995, Huntsville Hospital recognized Dr. Haws with the naming of the Neurosurgery Progressive Care Unit in his honor. As both the Chief of Staff and Chief of Surgery at that hospital, he was instrumental in the expansion and improvement of its facilities especially the Neurosurgery Division which he helped create. On active staff at three local hospitals and on consulting staff at eight, Dr. Haws' proven excellence has been very much in demand.

To me, he symbolizes the model doctor: brilliant, talented, caring and dedicated. In addition to his demanding professional life, Dr. Haws has found time to get involved in his community and lends his leadership to the Boys and Girls Club of Huntsville and the Boy's Ranch of Alabama.

As he prepares to leave the North Alabama Neurological, P.A., I sincerely hope he will take the time to enjoy farming and fishing, two of his favorite hobbies. This is a richly deserved rest and I join his wife, Patsy, and his six children in congratulating him on a job well done. I wish him the best in his future years.

Having personally known Dr. Haws for many years, I am thankful for this opportunity to recognize his tremendous medical service and academic accomplishments as well as express my appreciation for his extraordinary contributions to the larger community of North Alabama.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVID A YARGER, FORMER CITY ATTORNEY OF VERSAILLES, MISSOURI

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this means to share a few words with you regarding the career of David A. Yarger, of Versailles, Missouri, who recently retired from his post as City Attorney after serving more than 33 years.

Since December of 1966, Mr. Yarger has provided countless hours of legal guidance to the citizens of Versailles and served diligently as the Prosecuting Attorney for the City of Versailles. In addition to his service as City Attorney, David Yarger has worked to acquire new industries in his community, and he was instrumental in creating the Versailles Park Board. Mr. Yarger has also dedicated his time to the establishment of the Roy E. Otten Memorial Airport and has served as the chairman and secretary of the airport board.

David Yarger is a member and past president of the Versailles Lions Club. He has served on the Morgan County Fair Board and the Fair Cook Shack Committee. As a pilot, Mr. Yarger has frequently made available his time to fly city officials and other residents of the community to destinations throughout Missouri, and he is responsible for the outstanding aerial photographs taken during Versailles' annual and well-attended Old Tyme Apple Festival.

Mr. Speaker, David A. Yarger has established himself as a civic leader in Versailles and Morgan County. His career and dedication to his community show that he is a role model for all Americans. I am certain that the members of this body will join me in congratulating Mr. Yarger for a job well-done.

HOW FORGIVENESS CAN SHAPE OUR FUTURE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a valued mentor, a key advisor, and dear friend who recently wrote an article which appeared in the Santa Barbara News-Press, entitled ''How Forgiveness Can Shape Our Future.''

In addition to being one of Santa Barbara's outstanding public citizens, Mr. Frank K. Kelly has been a journalist, a speech writer for President Truman, Assistant to the Senate Majority Leader, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and Vice President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues and ask them to join me in honoring the career and contributions of Mr. Frank K. Kelly.

HOW FORGIVENESS CAN SHAPE OUR FUTURE

Frank K. Kelly

Human beings have tremendous capacities to be creative and compassionate, cooperative and generous—and shocking abilities to inflict terrible pain upon one another.

Is it possible for us to face the monstrous atrocities in the human record and yet to participate in the process of reconciliation, to accept the awful truth about ourselves and others and still move into the future with strong hope?

In a heart-wrenching report recently published, the man who headed South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission wrestles with these questions and offers us reasons for continuing to believe in the possibilities of spiritual growth for the human family. Archbishop Desmond Tutu regards the transformation of South Africa from a state of oppression to a state of cooperation as an amazing example of human potentiality responding to a surge of God's grace.

In his new book, Tutu says: ''South Africans managed an extraordinary, reasonably peaceful transition from the awfulness of oppression to the relative stability of democracy. They confounded everyone by their novel manner of dealing with a horrendous past.''

Many people had expected a blood bath involving the deaths of thousands of human beings would occur when Nelson Mandela took office as the first black president of South Africa. But that had not happened.

''There was this remarkable Truth and Reconciliation Commission to which victims expressed their willingness to forgive and perpetrators told their stories of sordid atrocities while also asking for forgiveness from those they had wronged so grievously,'' Tutu declares. ''The world could not quite believe what it was seeing.''

Tutu was asked to speak in Ireland in 1998, to explain in a strife-torn country how South Africa had become a peaceful country without bursts of revengeful violence. The South African experience had indicated that ''almost no situation could be said to be devoid of hope.''

Describing what had happened in his country, Tutu urged the Irish not to become despondent over the obstacles which were preventing the implementation of the agreement reached by the competing factions.

''In South Africa it had often felt as if we were on a roller-coaster ride,'' Tutu said. ''At one moment we would experience the most wonderful joy, euphoria even, at some new and crucial initiative. We would see the promised land of peace and justice around the corner. Then, just when we thought we had entered the last lap, something ghastly would happen—a massacre, a deadlock, brinkmanship of some kind—and we would be scraping the bottom of despair and despondency. I told them this was normal.''

In addition to offering encouragement to the peacemakers in Ireland, Tutu has

brought messages of hope to other areas of the world torn by violence. He has reminded people of what has to be done:

''At the end of their conflicts, the warring groups in Northern Ireland, the Balkans, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, Burma, Afghanistan, Angola, the Sudan, the two Congos, and elsewhere are going to have to sit down together to determine just how they will be able to live together amicably, how they might have a shared future devoid of strife, given the bloody past that they have recently lived through.''

Based on the experience of South Africa, Tutu is convinced that forgiveness is a key element in creating a lasting peace and releasing the positive energy necessary to build a better future for humanity. He believes that true reconciliation of enemies is impossible without the new perspectives brought about by deep forgiveness.

''Forgiving and being reconciled are not about pretending that things are other than they are,'' Tutu acknowledges. ''True reconciliation exposes the awfulness, the abuse, the pain, the degradation . . . It is a risky undertaking but in the end it is worthwhile, because in the end dealing with the real situation helps to bring real healing.''

With the other members of the South African commission, Tutu was frequently astonished at ''the extraordinary magnanimity that so many of the victims exhibited.'' There were some persons who admitted that they could not forgive the hardships inflicted on them, which demonstrated the fact that ''forgiveness was neither cheap nor easy.''

''In forgiving, people are not being asked to forget,'' Tutu declares. ''On the contrary, it is important to remember, so that we should not let such atrocities happen again. Forgiveness does not mean condoning what has been done . . . It involves trying to understand the perpetrators and so have empathy, to try to stand in their shoes and appreciate the sort of pressures and influences that might have conditioned them.''

Tutu points out. ''In the act of forgiveness, we are declaring our faith in the future of a relationship and in the capacity of the wrongdoer to make a new beginning on a course that will be different from the one that caused us the wrong . . . It is an act of faith that the wrongdoer can change.''

Tutu acknowledges that he and others in the commission were strongly affected by their religious faith. But he expresses the conviction that all human beings will ''always need a process of forgiveness and reconciliation to deal with those unfortunate yet all too human breaches in human relationships. They are an inescapable characteristic of the human condition.''

Archbishop Tutu sums up his conclusions in the title of his book—''No Future Without Forgiveness.'' Whether human beings like it or not, we will have to forgive one another in order to survive.

In my own life, I have found it extremely hard to forgive people who have treated me with cruelty or contempt. I have also found it hard to forgive myself for the severity with which I treated my sons when they were children. I convinced myself that I punished them for their own benefit, to make sure they followed the right path, but I later realized I had harmed them by my angry words and outbursts of rage. I had suffered often from the punishing behavior of my own father and it took me years to forgive him. My own sons have forgiven me more readily than I forgave him. The whole process has been painful but cleansing in the end.

When I wrote speeches for Harry Truman in the 1948 presidential campaign I used harsh words to describe the actions taken by the Republican leaders in the Congress. I was not ready to forgive them and I hoped that my fellow citizens would punish them in the election that year. I was exhilarated when Truman triumphed and the Republicans lost their majority in the Congress. It seemed to me I had taken part in a righteous cause—and I still believe that. Yet the hot words of that campaign produced bitter feelings among the losers and a hostile atmosphere which made it almost impossible for Mr. Truman to get his proposals enacted. He forgave nearly all of the leaders who had attacked him, but some of those leaders would not forgive him for the charges he had made against them.

In all of the election campaigns that have occurred since the United States was founded, injuries have been inflicted—injuries that might have been healed by a better understanding of the power of forgiveness. If we are going to solve the tremendous problems we face now and in the future, we must learn from the South African experience that facing the truth and engaging in continuous efforts for reconciliation are essential for all of us.

It is not easy to uncover the full truth about any situation. In the decades I have lived since I was born in 1914, I have been searching for the truth about many of the events which have affected my life—and I now realize that the process of seeking and discovering what really happened to me and millions of others in those crowded years may go on forever. I now try to base my comprehension on the French saying: ''To understand all is to forgive all.''

For many years I placed the blame for the two World Wars of the 20th century principally on the Germans—and I could not forgive them for the tremendous devastation I believed they had caused in the world. Under the Kaiser, they had been belligerent and savage; under Hitler, they had tortured and murdered millions of people. Perhaps God could forgive them for what they had done in that century. I couldn't.

Perhaps my enduring rage against the Germans was partly due to the disfiguring wounds that had been inflicted on my father in World War I. He came home from that war with a hole in his neck and a twisted face that frightened me. In my childhood I had to awaken him from nightmares in which he was fighting with Germans who were trying to kill him with trench knives and bayonets. He had engaged in hand-to-hand, face-to-face, combat in the trenches in France—and he never got over it. His screams will echo always in my mind. He had killed enemies with his own bayonet but they were always coming back at him in nights of horror.

While I can never condone the atrocities committed by some Germans under the Kaiser and under Hitler, I have learned enough about the history of Germany and the history of other nations to understand why those atrocities occurred. When I was a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, I heard a former chancellor of the German Democratic Republic, Heinrich Bruning, describe how Count von Papen and other German aristocrats tricked President Paul von Hindenburg into appointing Hitler as chancellor of Germany. Hitler had been defeated by Hindenburg in the German election of 1932, but he was placed in power later by plotters who thought they could control him. The monstrous rise of Nazism was due to the errors of arrogant men. Such errors have been crucial factors in the history of many nations.

My father participated voluntarily in World War I, answering Woodrow Wilson's call to serve in ''a war to end a war'' and ''to make the world safe for democracy.'' But many of the Germans who fought in that bloody struggle believed that God was on their side and they were justified in what they did. In the light of history, I realized that many of their men who fought in the trenches suffered from ghastly nightmares similar to those which afflicted my father. War itself was an encompassing evil which brought evil effects to many generations of human beings.

Desmond Tutu's harrowing book, which links truth and reconciliation to the power of forgiveness, offers ways to enable future generations to end the savage cycles of war and revenge. Let us hope that people all over this bleeding world will read it and learn from it. It sheds a great light on what needs to be done.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL PETER J. ROWAN OF THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute Lt. Col. Peter J. Rowan. Since July 1998, Lt. Col. Rowan has served as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' District Engineer for the Chicago District. His term in Chicago is nearly at its end, and he is scheduled to leave for his next posting in late July.

Over the course of the last two years, I have had the distinct pleasure of working with him as we partnered up on a number of projects. The Chicago Shoreline, TARP, Stoney Creek, and the Illinois and Michigan Canal. The list goes on and on and on. In every case and in every instance, he has done a wonderful job in working with my staff and me.

Lt. Col. Rowan began his career at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, where he graduated in 1979. He continued his education and received a master's degree in civil engineering from the University of Illinois. He also undertook additional studies in the Engineer Officers Advanced Course and the Command and General Staff College.

He then used his advanced training to further Corps missions across the United States, from Colorado to Nebraska to Kansas and Texas. He also served combat-related assignments in Germany. For the 249th Engineer Battalion in Karlsruhe, he was a platoon leader, company executive officer, and assistant operations officer. He then went on to serve as assistant corps engineer with V Corps, part of the 130th Engineer Brigade in Heidelberg.

His hard work and professional accomplishments have not gone unnoticed. Lt. Col. Rowan is the recipient of a number of awards and decorations for his service, including the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Parachutist Badge, and the Ranger Tab.

But his most heartwarming accomplishment may very well be that of his family. Lt. Col. Rowan is a devoted husband to his wife and a wonderful father to four children.

I know that I speak for my colleagues from Chicagoland when I say that Lt. Col. Rowan's professionalism, responsiveness, and leadership is an asset to the Corps and our nation. He has done so much for the Chicago District, and I know he will continue to do even more in his career. I salute Lt. Col. Rowan and wish him and his family all the best.

KINDNESS IS CONTAGIOUS IN CONGRESS

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a successful anti-violence organization in my district. Founded in 1982 in Kansas City, the STOP Violence Coalition's mission is to promote non-violence through education, programming, and collaboration. The program serves 25,000 students, parents, educators, and inmates each year through kindness education, bullying prevention, and inmate rehabilitation. Its founder and one of my constituents, SuEllen Fried, is a well-known leader in the fields of child abuse and peer abuse prevention.

The STOP Violence Coalition has had success with many of its programs. The Reaching Out From Within™ program, directed toward inmate rehabilitation, has a 23% recidivism rate, compared to the national average of approximately 60%. The Coalition has also compiled the 12 Contributing Factors to Violence™, organized the Elder Rights Coalition™, and collaborated with area agencies to address issues related to violence prevention and organization. The Coalition has received the 1999 National American Community Award from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

One of the STOP Violence Coalition's most effective programs is the Kindness is Contagious™ program. Last week, at the request of another community leader, who is also of my constituents, Norman Polsky, I distributed Kindness is Contagious . . . Catch it! buttons to each of my colleagues in the House. The purpose of the buttons is to wear the Kindness button until someone is observed behaving kindly toward another, at which time the button is passed on. The recipient is asked to observe others for kind behavior and to pass on the button to someone else who deserves the recognition. Thus it become everyone's responsibility to continue the chain of kindness and giving.

Though the program is school-based, the message is not just for youth. Youth and grown-ups alike need to keep in mind that although we have strong feelings and will disagree about certain things, at the end of the day we should always treat people with the dignity they deserve.

Nearly 300,000 students in 400 Kansas City area schools have participated in Kindness is Contagious™, which promotes the passing of the Kindness button. Since June of this year, over 1,500 inquiries from concerned citizens throughout the country and world have contacted the STOP Violence Coalition to see how they can start the Kindness program in their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, this program is something that has made people around the nation stop and think about their personal behavior and how it affects others, something all of us—within and outside of Congress—should always keep in mind. I would like to thank SuEllen Fried and Normal Polsky for their leadership and vision with these programs and their many efforts throughout our community. I commend them for their tireless service and dedication.

I hope these buttons will change hands many times and encourage caring, consideration, and compassion. I will be wearing this button in an effort to promote kindness. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort and spread this program to their districts.

TRIBUTE TO MS. DEBBIE RUMMEL: MIDWEST DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take this opportunity to officially recognize an outstanding educator from the 16th district of Illinois for her important contributions to advancing educational excellence in Illinois.

Ms. Debbie Rummel lives in Spring Grove and is a physical education teacher at Antioch Community High School in Antioch, IL. She exemplifies the innovation and encouragement that teachers can bring to education. Ms. Rummel has recently been recognized by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) for her outstanding teaching skills and her ability to influence students to continue to engage in physical activities throughout life.

Beyond receiving NASPE's Midwest District High School Physical Educator of the Year Award, Ms. Rummel has also been inducted into the University of Wisconsin-Platteville's Athletic Hall of Fame, granted a Nutrition Education Teaching Award from Illinois NET, and received a Governor's Award of Excellence in Physical Education and Fitness.

I am honored and pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the hard work and dedication that characterizes Ms. Rummel's gift of teaching.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the chamber on Monday, July 17 when rollcall votes numbered 401, 402, 403 and 404 were cast. Had I been present in the Chamber at the time these votes were cast, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 401, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 402, ''yes'' on rollcall vote 403 and ''no'' on rollcall vote 404.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, last week I was granted leave of absence for July 19, 2000 and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Had I been present, I would have voted on the following rolls, as indicated:

No. 412—On Passage of H.R. 1102, the Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act—''Yea''

No. 413—On Agreeing to the Conference Report for the Defense Appropriations Act for FY 2001, H.R. 4576—''Yea''

No. 415—Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4577, Making Appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services for Fiscal Year 2001—''Yea''

No. 416—On Passage of H.R. 2634, the Drug Addiction Treatment Act—''Yea''.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when we considered this bill earlier, I voted for it, although I was very reluctant to do so. But I cannot vote for this conference report.

My support for the bill was reluctant because while I support ending the ''marriage penalty,'' I thought the House bill was not the right way to achieve that goal. In some areas it did too little, and in others it did too much.

It did too little because it did not adjust the Alternative Minimum Tax. That means it would have left many middle-income families unprotected from having most of the promised benefits of the bill taken away. The Democratic substitute would have adjusted the Alternative Minimum Tax, which is one of the reasons I voted for that better bill.

The Republican leadership's bill did too much in another area. Because it was not carefully targeted, it did not just apply to people who pay a penalty because they are married. Instead, a large part of the total benefits under the bill would have gone to married people whose taxes already are lower than they would be if they were single. In other words, a primary result would not be to lessen marriage ''penalties'' but to increase marriage ''bonuses.''

And, by going beyond what's needed to end marriage ''penalties'' the House bill would have gone too far in reducting the surplus funds that will be needed to bolster Social Security and Medicare.

Those were the reasons for my reluctance to vote for this bill. They were strong reasons. In fact, as I said then, if voting for the bill would have meant that it immediately would have become law, I would have voted against it. But, I reluctantly voted for it because at that point the Senate still had a chance to improve it.

I was prepared to give the Republican leadership one last chance to correct the bill's deficiencies rather than simply to insist on sending it to the President for the promised veto. I hope that the Republican leadership would allow the bill to be improved to the point that it would merit becoming law—meaning that it would deserve the President's signature.

Unfortunately, they did not take advantage of that opportunity. Instead, today they are insisting on sending to the President a bill that falls short of being appropriate for signature into law. I cannot support that approach, and I cannot support this conference report.

The conference report is not identical to the House bill, but it is still very poorly targeted.

Half of the tax relief would go to couples who are not affected by any marriage penalty at all—and overall the bill is still fatally flawed. It seems clear that the Republican leadership has decided to insist on trying to force the President to veto this bill, on a timetable based on their national nominating convention.

I greatly regret that the Republican leaders have decided to insist on confrontation with the President instead of seeking a workable compromise that would lead to a bill that the President could sign into law.

The President has said that he will veto this conference report, and I expect that to occur. I hope that after that veto members on both sides of the aisle will work to develop a bill that will appropriately address the real problem of the ''marriage penalty'' and that can be signed into law this year.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4922, THE TMDL REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2000

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4922, The TMDL Regulatory Accountability Act of 2000.

TMDL stands for ''Total Maximum Daily Loads.'' TMDLs are useful tools provided by the Clean Water Act to bring water bodies into compliance with water quality standards. I support the Clean Water Act's TMDL program. I am pleased that EPA, States, and Congress are finally turning their attention to this program and are providing more resources for States to move ahead and develop and implement TMDLs under existing regulations.

However, like many, I have concerns about EPA's proposed changes to the TMDL program. I have expressed my concerns about these proposed changes, and the process used by EPA to make these changes, at hearings, in letters and phone calls to EPA Administrator Browner and the Director of OMB, Jacob Lew, and in public statements.

I have not been alone in expressing concerns. Many Members of Congress, the National Governor's Association and individual governors, the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators and individual state agencies, EarthJustice Legal Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, the Conservation Law Foundation, California Association of Sewerage Agencies, the National Federation of Independent Business, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Forest and Paper Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, PACE International Union, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America all have expressed serious concerns about EPA's proposals.

I find it significant that the National Governors' Association, the State Water Pollution Control Administrators, EarthJustice Legal Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, and the Conservation Law Foundation all share the view that EPA's new TMDL regulations will actually hinder progress in improving water quality and will slow down implementation of the TMDL program.

These State organizations and environmental organizations have different reasons for holding this view.

On July 6, 2000, NGA wrote to President Clinton that—

''The TMDL rules have the potential to cause major financial burdens on our state environmental agencies and severe economic impacts on our states.''

''The restrictive language of the regulation will virtually eliminate the flexibility of states to offer opportunities to reduce overall pollution between waterbodies.''

''The 'one-size-fits-all' approach proposed by the regulations will inevitably fail, resulting in mountains of paperwork and no appreciable improvement in water quality.''

The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators wrote to Administrator Browner that—

''It is the view of the majority of the state water quality program managers responsible for the day to day implementation of the clean water programs, that this set of rules is technically, scientifically and fiscally unworkable.''

On May 19, 2000, six environmental organizations wrote to Administrator Browner that—

''Due to the problems we outline below, we are asking you to withdraw the current version of the proposed rule, which is so fundamentally flawed that it would weaken the existing TMDL program. In addition, we are concerned that if the Administration attempts to finalize this rule, the overwhelming opposition it faces in Congress could result in a weakening of the Clean Water Act itself.''

''Our organizations have many objections to the August 23 proposal, the most serious of which include the unjustifiably long timeline of up to 15 years to states to prepare TMDLs, the lack of requirements for EPA to step in and do the job if states fail to submit TMDLs or miss other regulatory deadlines, the omission of deadlines for meeting water quality standards, and the overall unenforceability of the new program.''

Of the six groups that signed the May 19 letter, three (Friends of the Earth, EarthJustice Legal Defense Fund, and the Conservation Law Foundation) continue to oppose the TMDL rule.

The state organizations and environmental organizations I quoted from have very different views on how to improve the TMDL program. However, they all share the goal of improving the TMDL program so that it is a more effective tool for improving water quality. Given this shared goal, I believe that we should be able to develop program improvements that can be embraced by both the National Governors' Association and environmental groups. And, given the difficulties in addressing nonpoint source pollution, it is critical to have the support and cooperation of the nonpoint source community. Rushing a regulation through that threatens lawsuits and withholding funds to achieve compliance will not result in improved water quality. It will only undermine public support for Clean Water Act programs.

EPA has failed to demonstrate leadership on this issue. As a result, EPA's new TMDL regulations, signed by Administrator Browner on July 11, do not have public support. In fact, aside from some in the environmental community, EPA can point to only two or three states and one organization representing the regulated community—the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies—that support the final rule. And even with in AMSA there is not agreement. The California Association of Sewerage Agencies, representing 95 California municipal sewerage agencies, shares the view held by most organizations representing point sources—that ''the administration's apparent decision to rush to publication of an important rule will only promote litigation and years of delays in responding to actual threats to our nation's lakes, rivers and coastal waters.''

I am not suggesting that all persons must agree with regulations, but EPA has made no attempt to engage in the public discourse that must take place to unite stakeholders behind the common goal of improving water quality, despite numerous requests from stakeholders asking EPA to allow additional public comment and seeking additional information from EPA on the impacts of the new TMDL regulations.

Fortunately, EPA's new TMDL regulations will not become effective until fiscal year 2002 and we have the opportunity for additional comment and analysis that many stakeholders and many members of Congress had asked EPA to undertake before finalizing its new TMDL rule.

First, we need to engage the public on this issue. EPA dismissed the criticism of its new TMDL rule as ''misunderstanding'' of EPA's intent. The final rule and EPA's preamble explaining intent were published in the Federal Register on July 13, 2000.

H.R. 4922 requires EPA to solicit and respond to public comment on EPA's changes to the TMDL program.

Second, we need to understand the scope of the problem. In her July 11, 2000 press release announcing the signing of the new TMDL regulations, Administrator Browner states that ''40 percent of America's waters are still too polluted.'' However, EPA's estimate of the costs of developing and implementing TMDLs is based on 20,000 impaired waterbodies—representing only 10 percent of the Nation's waters. What is the scope of the problem? 40 percent impairment or 10 percent? The General Accounting Office pointed out in a recent report that only 6 states have sufficient data to identify the scope of water quality impairments in the State. As a result, neither EPA nor the public knows the actual scope of the water quality problem.

H.R. 4922 requires EPA to come up with a plan to fill these data gaps, and create a budget for implementing that plan.

Third, we need an understanding of what methods should be used to address these matters. Too often, EPA's new TMDL regulations simply assume away difficult water quality problems. For example, the new regulations consider the sun a source of pollution—heat—but do not explain how to go about regulating the sun, stating that: ''What needs to be done to mitigate heat load from solar input will be addressed by a State, Territory, or authorized Tribe when it establishes the TMDL.'' The final rule similarly has no answers for how to address pollution from atmospheric deposition, or legacy pollution.

H.R. 4922 includes a study by the National Academy of Sciences to improve our ability to identify sources of pollution and allocate loadings among them.

Fourth, we need an understanding of what kind of sacrifices the public must make to solve our remaining water quality problems, and the benefits that will be achieved if we dedicate resources to this effort. Again, EPA has failed to provide this information. EPA estimates that the total cost of the TMDL rule will be less than $23 million a year. EPA did not

provide any estimate of the benefits of the rule. However, as the General Accounting Office pointed out in another recent report, EPA's cost estimate assumes that States already have all the data they need to develop TMDLs, an assumption that has no basis in reality. In addition, EPA fails to inform the public of the costs to the regulated community from implementation of the rule, including costs to small businesses and small farming or forestry operations. Instead, EPA would have the public believe that improving water quality is all gain and no pain. I am very concerned about a backlash against Clean Water Act programs when EPA tries to implement the new regulation and the cost is more than the public is prepared to pay.

H.R. 4922 requires EPA to conduct a complete analysis of the costs and benefits of its TMDL rule in a manner that addresses the Comptroller General's criticisms of the EPA's earlier cost estimate. In addition, H.R. 4922 requires EPA to quantify the effects of the rules on small entities, including small businesses small organizations, and small governmental organizations.

H.R 4922 does not affect EPA's existing TMDL program. I strongly encourage States to proceed with TMDL development and implementation under existing regulations as expeditiously as possible. Fortunately, the House-passed VAHUD appropriations bill provides significant new resources for States to do so.

H.R. 4922 also does not affect EPA's new TMDL regulations. However, after considering the additional public input and additional information developed under this legislation, I hope that EPA will conclude that its new TMDL regulations should be changed before they become effective in fiscal year 2002.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE ULSTER UNITED TRAVEL SOCCER CLUB

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exciting event between the Ulster County, New York United Travel Soccer Club and the Shrewsbury House Soccer Club of England.

On August 30th and 31st, the two Soccer Clubs will compete against each other in the Cantine Field Sports Complex in my hometown of Saugerties, New York. The matches will promote a greater understanding between the players and continue the great tradition of cooperation between the United States and England.

The players from England will be staying with families in Saugerties, which will serve as an educational experience for the players and citizens of Saugerties. Indeed, as our world becomes increasingly connected, it is critically important that we provide opportunities for our children to interact with different cultures. The athletic contests will help facilitate an exchange of ideas and I am pleased to welcome the Shrewsbury House Soccer Club to Ulster County.

The Ulster United Travel Soccer Club is an important resource for the young people of my district. Indeed, the club promotes teamwork, sportsmanship, positive thinking and physical fitness. In addition, the Club is a member of the Northern Catskill Youth Association (NCYA) and participates in tournaments throughout the Northeast. I applaud the Ulster United Travel Soccer Club for its steadfast commitment to our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to salute the Ulster United Travel Soccer Club and the Shrewsbury House Soccer Club for arranging this unique international competition.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY RENEWAL AND NEW MARKETS ACT

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2000

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, across America, the signs of prosperity are brightly lit. The economic boom that is the hallmark of the '90's can be seen in towering construction cranes, packed shopping malls, and flourishing businesses in every region of the nation. As the 21st Century opens, America's free market principles are triumphant, and the world is captivated by the American economic success story.

Given this bountiful setting, it is valid to ask why JIM TALENT, DANNY DAVIS and I joined together last year to re-introduce something called ''The American Community Renewal Act.'' In view of our booming national prosperity, the need for economic renewal may seem to many to be irrelevant at best, or needless at worst.

To answer that question, we might first look back to a dramatic moment from an earlier period of prolonged American prosperity.

The year was 1968 and, like today, Americans were building new homes, buying new products, creating new businesses, and generally enjoying an unprecedented prosperity. The national economic atmosphere was heady and exuberant.

But on May 21st of that year, millions of Americans sat before their television sets and were shocked by a report from the respected newsman Charles Kuralt entitled ''Hunger in America.'' That program exposed an unseen hunger and malnutrition that marked the lives of millions of Americans. The nation was shocked into action, and ending hunger in America became a critical national goal.

One editorial writer at that time, commenting on the documentary, noted: ''The contrast of a rich country harboring pockets of the most primitive want was its own editorial on the social contradiction of an affluent nation.''

Now it is over thirty years later, and there is a new social contradiction—a new unseen hunger in the midst of a prosperous America. It is a hunger for opportunity and it comes from America's poorest communities. It comes from the aging, struggling communities which most Americans have never seen—neighborhoods that have been bypassed by the national economic success story.

These are the communities that cannot attract the businesses and industry which bring the jobs which bring the opportunities that lead to the American dream.

These are the neighborhoods where vacant properties become home to crack users who destroy the sense of safety and security that a community needs to grow and prosper.

These are the neighborhoods where a long and expensive public transit ride is the only way to get to the new jobs in prosperous suburbs.

These are the neighborhoods where venture capital just doesn't venture.

Despite the strongest economic growth in this nation's history, too many people living in America's poorest neighborhoods are still being left behind.

Today you can do something about that.

The Community Renewal and New Markets Act that we are introducing today is the product of five years of hard work and extensive travel to find out what works from the people on the ground who are working every day to revive these neighborhoods.

This legislation establishes a new model that merges new ideas about venture capital, regulatory reform, drug and alcohol rehabilitation, housing and homeownership, commercial revitalization and tax incentives.

Hopefully, our efforts will bring America's attention into the most forgotten corners of America. I am hopeful we can give these troubled communities the tools they need to recover and to prosper.

Though we cannot promise success to every man, woman and child in America, we should be able to promise each of them the opportunity for success. This country is too great and too wealthy to allow even one of our children to grow up without that opportunity.

This is the essence of the social contract that we, as Americans, hold with one another. We are working to achieve this goal—to make good on this social contract—through passage of this important legislation.

In 1968 America's ''social contradiction'' was an unseen hunger for food in a nation that feeds the world. In the year 2000 that ''social contradiction'' is an unseen hunger for opportunity in a nation that represents unbridled opportunity to the rest of the world.

It is time to end that contradiction and bring the nurturing promise of opportunity home to all Americans. The Community Renewal and new Markets Act is an important step in that direction.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 26

8:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to review the federal sugar program.
SH–216

9 a.m.
Small Business
Business meeting to markup S. 1594, to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958.
SR–428A

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–406

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on broadband internet regulatory relief.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on Natural Gas Supply.
SD–366

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Public Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on bridging the gap between health disparities.
SD–430

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald Mancuso, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense; Roger W. Kallock, of Ohio, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Material Readiness; and James Edgar Baker, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1801, to provide for the identification, collection, and review for declassification of records and materials that are of extraordinary public interest to the people of the United States.
SD–342

Finance
To hold hearings on the nomination of Robert S. LaRussa, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade; the nomination of Ruth Martha Thomas, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury; the nomination of Lisa Gayle Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and the nomination of Lisa Gayle Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury.
SD–215

11 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–419

2 p.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the Americans with Disabilities Act.
SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2526, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.
SR–485

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by the President to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest for increased protection.
SD–366

JULY 27

9 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to review proposals to establish an international school lunch program.
SH–216

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine antitrust issues in the airline industry, focusing on trends in the industry, the impact that a reduction of competitors might have on competition and concentration levels at hubs.
SR–253

Environment and Public Works
To hold oversight hearings on the use of comparative risk assessment in setting priorities and on the Science Advisory Board's Residual Risk Report.
SD–406

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine Yugoslav Presidnet Slobodan Milosevic's recent efforts to perpetuate his power by forcing through changes to the Yugoslav consitution and cracking down on opposition and independent forces in Serbia.
2255 Rayburn Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the United States General Accounting Office's investigation of the Cerro Grande Fire in the State of New Mexico, and from Federal agencies on the Cerro Grande Fire and their fire policies in general.
SD–366

Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
Business meeting to markup S. 2778, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting to markup S. 1898, to provide protection against the risks to the public that are inherent in the interstate transportation of violent prisoners; S. 113, to increase the criminal penalties for assaulting or threatening Federal judges, their family members, and other public servants; S. 783, to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; and S. 2448, to enhance the protections of the Internet and the critical infrastructure of the United States.
SD–226

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Justice Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine security for executive branch officials.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1734, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contribute funds for the establishment of an interpretative center on the life and contributions of President Abraham Lincoln; H.R. 3084, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contribute funds for the establishment of an interpretative center on the life and contributions of President Abraham Lincoln; S. 2345, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public use of sites associated with Harriet Tubman located in Auburn, New York; S. 2638, to adjust the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore to include Cat Island, Mississippi; H.R. 2541, to adjust the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore to include Cat Island, Mississippi; and S. 2848, to provide for a land exchange to benefit the Pecos National Historical Park in New Mexico.
SD–366

3:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on the nomination of John E. McLaughlin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.
SH–219

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 26

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on potential timber sale contract liability incurred by the government as a result of timber sale contract cancellations.
SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7459–S7491

Measures Introduced: Three bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2908–2910, and S. Res. 341. **Page S7477**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2101, to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–354)

S. 2266, to provide for the minting of commemorative coins to support the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and the programs of the United States Olympic Committee, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 106–355)

S. 2453, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to humanity. (S. Rept. No. 106–356)

S. 2459, to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation. (S. Rept. No. 106–357)

S. 1474, providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–358)

S. 2425, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the planning, design, and construction of the Bend Feed Canal Pipeline Project, Oregon, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 106–359) **Page S7477**

Measures Passed:

Eulogies to the Late Senator Coverdell: Senate agreed to S. Res. 341, authorizing the printing of certain materials in honor of Paul Coverdell. **Page S7468**

Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4871, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. **Pages S7468–69**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur on Wednesday, July 26, 2000. **Pages S7468–69**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S7469**

Intelligence Authorization: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2507, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. **Pages S7469–70**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur on Wednesday, July 26, 2000. **Pages S7469–70**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S7470**

Agriculture Appropriations Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the adoption of certain technical corrections to the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 4461, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (passed by the Senate on July 20, 2000). **Page S7490**

Messages From the House: **Page S7475**

Communications: **Pages S7475–77**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S7477–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7482–84**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S7484**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7472–75**

Adjournment: Senate adjourned for one minute thus changing the legislative day. **Page S7468**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12:01 p.m., and adjourned at 5:14 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 25, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7491.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 4919–4941; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 379 and H. Res. 562, were introduced. **Pages H6776–77**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Filed on July 20, H.R. 4033, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests, amended (H. Rept. 106–776);

Filed on July 20, H.R. 4844, to modernize the financing of the railroad retirement system and to provide enhanced benefits to employees and beneficiaries, amended (H. Rept. 106–777, Pt. 1);

Filed on July 20, H.R. 3380, to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal jurisdiction over offenses committed outside the United States by persons employed by or accompanying the Armed Forces, or by members of the Armed Forces who are released or separated from active duty prior to being identified and prosecuted for the commission of such offenses, amended (H. Rept. 106–778, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2842, to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage, amended (H. Rept. 106–779);

H.R. 4865, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits, amended (H. Rept. 106–780);

H.R. 4864, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reaffirm and clarify the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, amended (H. Rept. 106–781);

H.R. 1283, to establish legal standards and procedures for the fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos exposure, amended (H. Rept. 106–782); and

H.R. 4850, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing compensation and life insurance benefits for veterans (H.Rept. 106–783). **Pages H6775–76**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:32 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H6721**

Moment of Silence in Honor of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson: The Chair announced that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun. At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair recognized the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory. **Page H6721**

Committee To Attend the Funeral of the Late Senator Paul Coverdell from Georgia: Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 558, the Chair announced the appointment of the following members of the House to the Committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia: Speaker Hastert and Representatives Lewis of Georgia, Bishop, Collins, Deal, Kingston, Linder, McKinney, Barr, Chambliss, Norwood, Isakson, and Graham. **Pages H6721–22**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Safety of Citizens Injured While Traveling in Mexico: H. Con. Res. 232, amended, expressing the sense of Congress concerning the safety and well-being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico; **Pages H6722–24**

Release of Rabiya Kadeer, Her Secretary, and Her Son by the People's Republic of China: S. Con. Res. 81, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H6724–26**

Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Improvement Act: H.R. 4002, amended, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to revise and improve provisions relating to famine prevention and freedom from hunger; **Pages H6726–30**

Defense and Security Assistance Act: H.R. 4919, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, and to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries; **Pages H6730–34**

National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month: H. Con. Res. 371, supporting the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month; **Pages H6734–35**

National Historical Publications and Records Commission Authorization: H.R. 4110, amended, to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005; **Pages H6735–36**

Death in Custody Reporting Act: H.R. 1800, amended, to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to ensure that certain information regarding prisoners is reported to the Attorney General; **Pages H6736–37**

Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact: H.R. 4700, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact (passed by a yea and nay vote of 376 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 429); **Pages H6737–45, H6752–53**

Red River Boundary Compact Between Texas and Oklahoma: H.J. Res. 72, amended, granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact; **Pages H6745–47**

Encouraging the Display of the National Motto, In God We Trust: H. Res. 548, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the national motto for the government of a religious people; **Pages H6747–50**

Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act: H.R. 2773, amended, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system. Agreed to amend the title. **Pages H6750–52, H6754**

Tribal Self-Governance Amendments: H. Res. 562, providing for the concurrence by the House, with amendments, in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1167, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes. **Pages H6753–54**

Order of Business—Trade Waiver for Vietnam: Agreed that it be in order at any time on July 25, 2000, or any day thereafter to consider in the House H.J. Res. 99, disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint resolution be waived; that it be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (in opposition to the joint resolution) and a Member in support; that the previous question be considered as ordered without intervening motion; and that the provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam for the remainder of the second session of the 106th Congress. **Page H6753**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:42 p.m. and reconvened at 5:30 p.m. **Page H6747**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H6721 and H6753.

Referrals: S. 2812 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page H6772**

Amendments: Amendments ordered pursuant to the rule appear on page H6778.

Quorum Calls Votes: One yea and nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on pages H6752–53. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOURTH AMENDMENT ISSUES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing on ''Fourth Amendment Issues Raised by the FBI's 'Carnivore' Program.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: Donald M. Kerr, Director, Lab Division; and Larry R. Parkinson, General Counsel, both with the FBI; Kevin V. DiGregory, Deputy Associate Attorney General; and David Green, Deputy Chief, Computer Crime and Intellectual Property Section; and public witnesses.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—PRESIDENTIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.J. Res. 88, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make eligible for the Office of President a person who has been a United States citizen for twenty years. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, to hold oversight hearings on aviation consumer service and delays, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the National Missile Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings on S. 1941, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide assistance to fire departments and fire prevention organizations for the purpose of protecting the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold hearings to examine pilot shortages on air service to smaller, rural markets, 2:15 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to continue markup of H.R. 701, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, 9 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings on S. 2877, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon; S. 2881, to update an existing Bureau of Reclamation program by amending the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, to establish a partnership program in the Bureau of Reclamation for small reclamation projects; and S. 2882, to authorize Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies to augment water supplies for the Klamath Project, Oregon and California, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings on the disposal of low activity radioactive waste, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight, to hold hearings on federal income tax issues relating to proposals to encourage the creation of public open spaces in urban areas and the preservation of farm and other rural lands for conservation purposes, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, to hold hearings to examine the importance of non-custodial fathers in the lives of their children, 2 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps, Narcotics and Terrorism, to hold hearings on environmental protection in an era of dramatic economic growth in Latin America, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Richard A. Boucher, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Public Affairs), 3 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings on Public Safety Officers' collective bargaining, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold oversight hearings on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 10 a.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings on the nomination of Mary H. Murguia, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona; Michael J. Reagan, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois; James A. Teilborg, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona; and Susan Ritchie Bolton, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, 2 p.m., SD–226.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: to hold hearings to examine the threats the drug ecstasy causes, 10 a.m., SD–628.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit, to consider H.R. 4788, United States Grain Standards Reauthorization Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, hearing on Conduct of Monetary Policy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Task Force on Housing and Infrastructure, hearing on "Economic Implications of Debt Held By Government Sponsored Enterprises," 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, oversight hearing on High Definition Television (HDTV) and related matters, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, hearing on "Defrauding Medicare: How easy is it and what can we do to stop it?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Postal Service, hearing on "The U.S. Postal Service and the Postal Inspection Service: Market Competition and Law Enforcement in Conflict?" 1 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to mark up H. Res. 544, congratulating the people of the United Mexican

States on the success of their democratic elections held on July 2, 2000; followed by a hearing on the International Criminal Court: A Threat to American Military Personnel?—Part 1, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, to mark up H. Res. 543, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the recent summit held by the Presidents of South Korea and North Korea, 2 p.m., H–139 Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 238, to amend section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose mandatory minimum sentences, and increase certain sentences, for bringing in and harboring certain aliens and to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for persons committing such offenses while armed; H.R. 2987, Methamphetamine Anti-Proliferation Act of 1999; H.R. 4640, DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000; H.R. 3235, the National Police Athletic League Youth Enrichment Act of 1999; H.R. 4292, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2000''; and H.R. 4870, Patent Technical Corrections Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing to examine laws, policies, practices, and operations of the Department of the Interior and Department of Energy related to payments to their employees (including federal public land oil royalty and valuation policy advisors) from outside sources (including the Project on Government Oversight); and to examine (a) the source of funds for such payments, (b) the relationship between those managing and overseeing the organization that made the payments and the individuals who received the payments, (c) the effect of the payments on programs, policies, and positions of such departments, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on H.R. 4656, to authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Washoe County School District for use as an elementary school site; followed by an oversight hearing on the Once and Future National Forest Timber Sale Program, 1 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.J. Res. 99, disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam; and a measure making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Nuclear's Energy Role: Improving U.S. Energy Security and Reducing Emissions, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials and Pipeline Transportation, to mark up the following: GSA's Fiscal Year 2001 Courthouse Construction Program; Out of Cycle Lease—San Francisco/Oakland, California (IRS); and other pending business, 10:30 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Ground Transportation, hearing on Short Line Rail Infrastructure Needs, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on VA pharmaceutical procurement policy, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up H.R. 4844, Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Improvement Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Additional Medicare Refinements to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, 1 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on Tax Treatment of Transportation Infrastructure, 2 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Global Hot Spots, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 4516, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 11:30 a.m., H–144, Capitol.

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 4577, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 1 p.m., SC–5, Capitol.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the recognition of two Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m.), Senate may continue consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 4871, Treasury/Postal Service Appropriations, and the motion to proceed to S. 2507, Intelligence Authorization.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Tuesday, July 25

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H.R. 4888, Protection of Innocent Children;
2. H.R. 4923, Community Renewal and New Markets;
3. H.R. 4850, Veterans Benefits Act;
4. H.R. 4864, Veterans Claims Assistance Act;
5. H.R. 1982, Donald J. Mitchell Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic, Rome, New York;
6. H. Con. Res. 351, Recognizing Medal of Honor Recipients in Heroes Plaza, Pueblo, Colorado;
7. H. Res. 549, 10th anniversary of the activation of National Guard and Reserve for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm;
8. H.R. 4846, National Recording Preservation Act;
9. H.R. 4924, Truth in Regulating Act;
10. H.R. 1651, Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments;
11. H.R. 3236, Use of Weber Basin Project, Utah facilities for beneficial purposes;
12. H.R. 3468, Duchesne City Water Rights Conveyance Act
13. H.R. 3676, Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Act
14. H.R. 3817, Jaryd Atadero Legacy Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado;
15. S. 1629, Oregon Land Exchange Act;
16. H.R. 4275, Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act;
17. H.R. 2919, National Underground Railroad Freedom Center Act;
18. S. 1910, Acquisition of Hunt House located in Waterloo, New York;
19. H.R. 2833, Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act;
20. S. 2327, Oceans Act;
21. H.R. 2462, Guam Land Return Act;
22. H.R. 4868, Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act;
23. H.R. 4710, Illegal Pornography Prosecution Act;
24. H.R. 4047, Two Strikes and You're Out Child Protection Act;
25. H.R. 3380, Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act;
26. H.R. 3485, Justice for victims of Terrorism;
27. H.R. 4033, Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act;
28. H. Res. 544, Congratulating the Mexican people on their successful elections;
29. H.R. 4697, International Anti-Corruption and Good Governance Act;
30. H.R. 4210, Preparedness Against Terrorism Act;
31. H.R. 4806, Designation of Carl Elliott Federal Building in Jasper, Alabama;
32. H. Con. Res. 372, 210th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Coast Guard;
33. H.R. 4807, Ryan White CARE Act Amendments;
34. H. Con. Res. 375, Supporting the goals of National Youth Day; and
35. H. Con. Res. 343, Expressing support for family mealtimes.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E1309
Boehlert, Sherwood L., N.Y., E1310
Burton, Dan, Ind., E1303
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1307
Cramer, Robert E. (Bud), Jr., Ala., E1307
Green, Gene, Tex., E1306
Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E1309
Hinchey, Maurice D., N.Y., E1311
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1303, E1304
Lipinski, William O., Ill., E1308
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E1305
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1303, E1304
Maloney, James H., Conn., E1305
Manzullo, Donald A., Ill., E1309
Moore, Dennis, Kans., E1309
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E1303
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E1307
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1304
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1309
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1306
Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E1311

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $165.00 for six months, $325.00 per year, or purchased for $2.75 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.